DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 046 HE 007 103

AUTHOR	Snyder, Norman C.
TITLE	School-College Articulation Practices in New York State.
INSTITUTION	New York State Education Dept., Albany.
SPONS AGENCY	National Academy of Education, Syracuse, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Feb 75
NOTE	158p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *College Admission; *College Bound Students; *College School Cooperation; *Higher Education; Post Secondary Education; Questionnaires; Surveys; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	*New York

ABSTRACT

There is much evidence that supports the assertion that the problems involved in school-college articulation are both significant and serious enough to warrant immediate attention and action. Data was collected from various sources by using a questionnaire designed: (1) to gather programs within the state; and (2) to serve the educative function of encouraging respondents to actively focus on the many varieties and types of school-college articulation and thus to stimulate developments on individual campuses. After an examination and survey of the typography, background, and literature of school-college articulation, specific conclusions are drawn. In general, both the schools and the colleges in the state appear to be open to greater articulation between the two sectors. Even thought they do not regard articulation as a major educational concern at present, most respondents who were interviewed were much interested in learning more about innovative practices and programs at other schools. The idea of a task force or a series of regional or statewide conferences on articulation met with much favor. (Author/KE)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED118046

SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION PRACTICES IN NEW YORK STATE

A Report prepared for the
New York State Commissioner of Education

By

Norman C. Snyder

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE007103

February, 1975

This report was supported by a grant from the
National Academy of Education

FOREWORD

This investigation was made possible by a summer research grant from the National Academy of Education and was conducted under the direction of New York State Commissioner of Education Ewald B. Nyquist. The study discusses the concept of articulation and reviews the history of relationships between secondary schools and colleges in the United States. Then, focusing solely on New York State, the study reports results of a survey of attitudes toward articulation by school and college administrators, assays the extent of major aspects of the articulation process, describes briefly examples of articulation in each general category, and makes recommendations for improving school-college articulation in the State.

For their invaluable aid and assistance in the planning and writing of this paper, I wish to offer special thanks to the following members of the Bureau of College Evaluation, State Education Department: Robert McHugh, Charles Meinert, and Donald Tritschler.

N.C.S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iv

I. THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION 1

- A. THE PROBLEM OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION
- B. OUTLINE OF METHODOLOGY

II. THE TOPOGRAPHY OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION 6

- A. THE MEANING OF ARTICULATION
- B. ARTICULATION VS. COORDINATION
- C. MAJOR CONTEXTS OF ARTICULATION
- D. AREAS OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION
- E. MODES OF ARTICULATION
- F. STRUCTURES OF ARTICULATION
- G. MAJOR AGENCIES OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION
- H. MAJOR OBSTACLES TO SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION

III. BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE 20

- A. A SHORT HISTORY OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION IN THE UNITED STATES
    - Phase I: The Search for a Coordinated System, 1870-1910
    - Phase II: The Schools Response to Industrial America, 1910-1940
    - Phase III: Mass Higher Education, 1940-1970
    - Phase IV: Universal-Access Higher Education, 1970-2000
- B. HISTORI[illegible] PERSPECTIVE ON SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION IN NEW YORK ST[illegible]

IV. RESULTS 54

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 114

APPENDICES 123

- A. SELECTED NEW YORK STATE DATA RELATING TO SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION (Tables 19-26) 124
- B. TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE 141

Page

C. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE 148

SELECTED REFERENCES 167

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page
1.	Postsecondary Questionnaire Returns Listed by Institutional Type	3
2.	Secondary Questionnaire Returns	3
3.	Total Sample: Mean % of Estimated School-College Articulation by Articulation Area	56
4.	Total Sample: Mean % of Estimated School-College Articulation by Mode of Articulation and Programmatic Articulation	57
5.	Total Sample: Mean % of Estimated Informal vs. Formal Structures in Articulation Practices by Area of Articulation	57
6.	Estimated Overall Articulation by Educational Sector	58
7.	Public Secondary Schools: Mean % of Estimated School-College Articulation by Articulation Area	59
8.	Postsecondary Institutions: Mean % of Estimated School-College Articulation by Articulation Area	60
9.	Private 4-Year: Mean % of Estimated School-College Articulation by Articulation Area	61
10.	SUNY 2- and 4-Year Combined: Mean % of Estimated School-College Articulation by Articulation Area	62
11.	SUNY 2-Year: Mean % of Estimated School-College Articulation by Articulation Area	63
12.	SUNY 4-Year: Mean % of Estimated School-College Articulation by Articulation Area	64
13.	% Estimated Priority Need for Improved Articulation by Area of Articulation and by Educational Sector	68
14.	Perceived Obstacles to Articulation by % Degree of Seriousness and by Educational Sector	71
15.	Estimated Importance of Cooperative School-College Articulation as a Campus Concern or Issue by Educational Sector	72
16.	Crediting Practices of Postsecondary Institutions by Credit Granted and by Courses Exempted 1974-75	74
17.	Admissions Practices listed by Postsecondary Sectors and by Categories of Common Application Form-Admissions Clearinghouse and Deferred Admissions	76
18.	School-College Articulation Practices in New York State in Selected Colleges and Universities	111

I. THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION

A. THE PROBLEM OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION

The problem of educational articulation is a very old one. The educational scene has changed in many ways, but the problems involved in articulation have remained largely the same, albeit that they now take on added significance during the present era of universal access mass education in a period of economic stringency and accompanying public demands for greater efficiency and accountability in education.

A rationale for concentrating on the interface between school and college at the present time is easy to develop. Historically, the major focus in articulation has always been largely concerned with this interface. The 1960's were something of an exception in the concentration focused on the problems involved in the transfer from community/junior college to 4-year or senior institutions as a result of the burgeoning college population of the time. Increased attention was also given during the same period to articulation between undergraduate and graduate education. The emphasis on both 2-year - 4-year and undergraduate-graduate articulation has continued into the 1970's, but at the same time many educators have returned to a consideration of the school-college interface as one containing many serious and growing unsolved problems in articulation. It might be noted that because of the expected expansion of graduate education in many fields and professions in the coming years, articulation between undergraduate and graduate education may compete successfully for the same degree of attention beginning to be given to school-college articulation. Finally, the transition to a "learning society" in which all citizens of all ages and circumstances have continual access to educational resources may mean that articulation between the educational system as a whole and society will come to be the major area of emphasis in the decades ahead.

To answer those critics who might claim that school-college articulation is not the most pressing present problem of articulation, it can be argued that the question of just where in the educational continuum the major problems in articulation lie is not now known, at least not on the basis of systematic research. Instead of the school-college interface, the really crucial problems might, for example, lie in the grammar school-high school interface or between the educational system as a whole and society. Granting this, there is much evidence that can be mustered to support the assertion that the problems involved in school-college articulation are both significant and serious enough to warrant immediate attention and action.

B. OUTLINE OF METHODOLOGY

The investigation involved the collection of data from five major sources of information within the State:

1. One hundred and seventy-six postsecondary institutions in the State which have the freshman year were sent a questionnaire, and a cover letter from the Commissioner of Education which explained the purpose of the investigation.[1] Ninety-four usable returns were obtained, resulting in an overall postsecondary response rate of 53%.

---

[1] See Appendix for a copy of the questionnaire and cover letter.

TABLE 1

POSTSECONDARY QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS LISTED BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

Institutional Type	Total (Freshman Year)	Number Usable Returned	% of Usable Returns
Public			
SUNY			
4 year	24	11	45.8%
2 year	36	24	66.7%
Private			
4 year	100	59	59.0%
2 year	16	0	00.0%
Total	176	94	53.4%

2. A random, proportional, and stratified sample of 286 secondary schools with a 12th grade program were sent the same questionnaire and cover letter. One hundred and twenty-two usable returns were obtained, resulting in a response rate of 14% for all New York State schools in this category (N=864) and a response rate of 43% for the sample.

TABLE 2

SECONDARY QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS

Total schools in New York State with 12th grade program	864
Survey sample	286
Usable returns	122
% usable returns for all New York State schools	14%
% usable returns for sample	43%

3. Thirty-one structured telephone interviews were conducted with representatives of postsecondary institutions which appeared to have especially promising and/or widespread programs involving school-college articulation. (See Appendix for a copy of the telephone interview schedule.)
4. Data from institutional responses to The Regents 1974 Progress Report Bulletin.[2]
5. Data from the information systems maintained in the State Education Department.

Note on the Statewide Questionnaire to Schools and Colleges

The questionnaire was designed to serve two functions: first, and most obvious, to gather valuable information concerning school-college articulation practices and programs within the State; second, to serve the educative function of encouraging respondents to actively focus on the many varieties and types of school-college articulation and thus to stimulate developments on individual campuses.

Responses from the City University of New York did not arrive in time for inclusion in this report. However, substantial descriptive material was obtained from telephone interviews and from officials in CUNY responsible for developing specific linkages between individual CUNY colleges and designated high schools.

---

[2] University of the State of New York, The Regents 1974 Progress Report Bulletin, Albany, New York, June 1973.

In addition, while the questionnaire was not mailed to Boards of Cooperative Educational Services, considerable data on the articulation activities of the BOCES Centers was obtained from the responses of high schools and colleges.

II. THE TOPOGRAPHY OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION

A. THE MEANING OF ARTICULATION

Like many other terms in the lexicon of education, articulation is rather ambiguously defined, referring to a variety of contexts and the interfaces or "joints" between various practices, programs, means, and goals, both within the educational system itself and between the former and society at large. The focus is usually on the needs and interests of the student in terms of the ease, efficiency, and continuity of his movement through the educational process, both _within_ a given major segment of the educational continuum (elementary, secondary, postsecondary and/or _between_ segments. The former is sometimes, but not always, referred to as _horizontal_ articulation, while the latter is termed _vertical_ articulation.[1,2]

Two widely used definitions of articulation which are largely consistent with the approach taken here are the following:

> "The manner in which the classroom instruction, curricular activities and instructional services of the school system are interrelated and interdependent, the aim being to facilitate the continuous and efficient education program of the pupils (e.g., from one grade to the next; from elementary to secondary school; and from secondary school to college), to interrelate various areas of the curriculum (e.g., Fine Arts and Language Arts), and/or to interrelate the

---

[1] Beryl R. McKinnerney, _Student Articulation Between Secondary and Post-Secondary Education_, College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University, College of Education, June, 1974, pp. 1-2.

[2] Michael J. Svob, "A Pilot Project for High School/Community College Articulation," _North Central Association Quarterly_, No. 47, Winter, 1973, p. 281.

school's instructional program with the program of out-of-school educational institutions (e.g., the home, church, youth groups and welfare agencies)."[3]

"The relationship and interdependence existing between the different elements of the educational program: may designate the degree of relationship among the different curricular offerings, between the curriculum and the institutional regimen, student activities and provisions for pupil guidance, or between the school's program and out-of-school educational institutions and activities (i.e., home, church, scouts, welfare agencies) or the extent to which the various levels of the educational system are so interrelated as to provide for continuous educational progress of the pupils with a minimum of repetition and a maximum of efficiency."[4,5]

Another distinction that is commonly made is that between *subject articulation* and *program articulation*. The former usually refers to articulation within a given subject in the curriculum (e.g., language, mathematics, etc.), while the latter usually refers to a program of studies which typically includes study in more than one subject (e.g., general science program, vocational program in allied health services, etc.). Finally, *reverse articulation* refers to the problems encountered by the student who transfers from a 4-year to a 2-year institution, although the term could be applied to the problems encountered by a student in any part of the educational continuum who is forced to retrace his steps for various reasons, such as the student who "flunks-out" of an early admissions program and is forced to return to high school.

---

[3] John F. Putnam and W. Dale Chismore (eds.), *Handbook VI, Standard Terminology for Curriculums and Instruction in Local and State School Systems*, 2nd ed., Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970, p. 75.

[4] C. V. Good, *Dictionary of Education*, 2nd ed., New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

[5] Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the NEA, *A Look at Continuity in the School Program*, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1958, pp. 4-5.

B. ARTICULATION VS. COORDINATION

Unless articulation is defined in terms of student needs and interests, it is difficult to distinguish between the meanings of articulation and coordination. Since the latter may or may not directly or indirectly involve student needs and interests, it may be useful to think of articulation as a mode of coordination which focuses upon these. It does not take much imagination to conceive of a situation where improved coordination might actually result in negative articulation. For example, a coordinated arrangement between a high school and college in the cooperative sharing of physical plants might result in significant cost savings to both institutions. Such an arrangement, however, might result in reduced coordination in terms of student needs and interests. We might also add the obvious observation that long-term coordination/articulation practices and programs may result in some cases in reduced or negative short-term coordination/articulation and vice versa.

Knoell and Medsker[6] and Knoell and Nelson[7] distinguish between articulation and coordination by defining articulation as being "centered on the students and their courses of study" while coordination is "centered on institutional budgets and building programs." While admitting that the goals of coordination overlap with the goals of articulation, they view coordinating agencies as representing the interests of society and the state as opposed to articulation programs which consider the interests of the individual student and his teachers. While sympathizing with the authors, one might object that the distinction drawn between coordination and articulation is needlessly and narrowly extreme, since it can be argued that an adequately structured and functioning system of coordination must have articulation as one of its major goals. In New York State, for example, all five of The Regents' Goals for Postsecondary education to A. D. 2000[8] are directly addressed to meeting the needs of students as well as society. Goal #2, A Comprehensive System of Postsecondary education, is specifically directed toward improved articulation in terms of "the continually evolving needs of the high school graduates of the State."

---

[6] Dorothy M. Knoell and Leland L. Medsker, From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965, p. 75.

[7] Dorothy M. Knoell and James H. Nelson, A Tentative Statement of Guidelines for Improving Articulation between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges, statement prepared for consideration at the Florida Articulation Conference, St. Petersburg, March 22-23, 1965, p. 11.

C. MAJOR CONTEXTS OF ARTICULATION

Articulation may be described as taking place within the following major contexts:

1. Within individual institutions
2. Between institutions at the same level (example: secondary school-secondary school)
3. Between institutions at different levels (example: secondary-postsecondary)

---

[8] University of the State of New York, Education Beyond High School: The Regents statewide plan for the development of postsecondary education, 1972, Albany, N. Y., November, 1972, pp. 10-11.

4. Between institutions at various levels and/or the educational system as a whole and society. (**Example:** work-study programs, community involvement programs, career and job advisement/placement programs, etc.)

D. AREAS OF SCHOOL - COLLEGE ARTICULATION

If articulation is very broadly defined, then all or almost all practices, programs, means, and goals related to the entire educational continuum might conceivably be included. If we restrict our definition to the interfaces between major practices, programs, people, and things at the juncture of secondary and postsecondary education, then the following areas appear to be most appropriate. It should be pointed out that these areas are not mutually exclusive and that much overlapping occurs.

1. Exit-Admission
2. Academic Advisement
3. Curriculum
4. Teaching Methods
5. Grading
6. Crediting
7. Credentialing
8. Remediation
9. Career Guidance
10. Personal and Social Counseling

Special Programs Including all of the above:

11. Adult Education
12. Occupational Education
13. Programs for Special Groups: minorities, retired, etc.
14. Work-Study Programs

E. MODES OF ARTICULATION

The following modes are descriptive of the various means by which articulation may be achieved within each articulation area:

1. Information exchange, communication, and feedback
2. Decision-making (includes planning)
3. Evaluation (practice or program)
4. Shared personnel (administrators, faculty, students, and staff)
5. Shared physical plant, special facilities, and services.

F. STRUCTURES OF ARTICULATION

Each of the foregoing modes of articulation may be structured on the following continua:

1. Cooperative vs. Noncooperative
2. Voluntary vs. Involuntary (legally mandated)
3. Formal vs. Informal
4. Local vs. Regional vs. Statewide vs. National
5. Unplanned vs. Programmatic (Planned)

Some definitions:

A cooperative structure of articulation is one in which the parties involved jointly participate and contribute in a more-or-less equal degree via one or more modes of articulation (information-sharing, decision-making, etc.) within one or more areas of articulation.

A noncooperative structure of articulation is one in which one of the parties involved participates and contributes unilaterally or far more than the other via one or more modes of articulation within one or more areas of articulation.

A voluntary structure of articulation is one in which the parties involved freely decide, without the coercion of binding rules, regulations, or laws, to participate and contribute via one or more modes of articulation within one or more areas of articulation.

An involuntary structure of articulation is one in which the parties involved are bound by rules, regulations, or laws beyond their immediate control, to participate via one or more modes of articulation within one or more areas of articulation.

A formal structure of articulation is one in which there exists a common body of explicit rules, regulations, or laws, usually written down in the form of guidelines, contracts, or agreements, which bind the participants and which specify an orderly and regular procedure or procedures to be followed via one or more modes of articulation within one or more areas of articulation.

An informal structure of articulation is one in which there exists a common body of implicit rules and regulations, rarely written down and not binding on the participants, which do not require an orderly or regular procedure or procedures to be followed via one or more modes of articulation within one or more areas of articulation.

Local vs. Regional vs. Statewide vs. National structure of articulation - refers to the geographical area covered by or included in one or more articulation practices or programs.

An unplanned (nonprogrammatic) structure of articulation is one that lacks a well-developed, systematic, and formal plan or procedure to be followed via one or more modes of articulation within one or more areas of articulation.

A programmatic (planned) structure of articulation is one in which there is a well-developed, systematic, and formal plan or procedure to be followed via one or more modes of articulation within one or more areas of articulation. Programmatic structures may be further classified as:

a. Limited - restricted to one mode of articulation and/or a small number of areas of articulation

b. Total - includes all modes of articulation and areas of articulation.

Discussion:

Historically, most school-school, school-college, and college-college articulation agreements/arrangements have been both cooperative and non-cooperative and largely voluntary, informal, and local. Since the rise of widespread public elementary, secondary, and post-secondary education in the nineteenth century, we can trace a gradually increasing rate and degree of state and federal control and coordination. The rate of such control and coordination has accelerated especially rapidly since World War II and promises to expand even more rapidly in the future. The direction of development is indicated in part by the tendency for articulation agreements and arrangements between schools at the same or different levels to become state or federally mandated (involuntary), programmatic, cooperative, formal, and state, regional, or national in scope. The strong social tradition, rooted in basic cultural values, of localized control and institutional autonomy in education persists, however, and it is difficult at this time to predict how far the strain toward increasing state and federal control/coordination will proceed in the face of this tradition which acts as a brake on further changes in this direction.

G. MAJOR AGENCIES OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION

The list which follows includes the major agencies through which school-college articulation may be achieved:

1. Students
2. Parents
3. Faculty (high school and college)
4. Administrators (high school and college)
5. Local and district school boards
6. Boards of trustees
7. City councils or town boards
8. State education agencies
9. State legislatures
10. Regional accrediting agencies
11. Regional or national educational professional associations
12. Federal education agencies
13. Federal legislature
14. Special interest groups (employers, the military, religious groups, minority groups, etc.)
15. High school and college collective bargaining agents.

Discussion:

As already indicated in the preceding section (II. E.), the evolution of the structure of education in the United States has been one in which local control and coordination has gradually given way to state and federal control and coordination. Traditionally, individual schools at all levels, whether public or private, have been afforded a high degree of institutional autonomy to plan and operate as they best see fit. The cycle of educational change in this country is one in which every new proposed expansion of state or federal power is almost immediately countered by a strong insistence upon a large amount of control remaining in local hands in order to maintain institutional autonomy, a plurality of educational practices and programs, and to avoid the drawbacks of a completely state or federally controlled system of education.

A manifold number and kind of major agencies influence and control our educational system. The influences, powers, and responsibilities of these various bodies overlap and conflict in considerable measure and the resultant overall structure of the educational enterprise is a complex labyrinth. Much of the difficulty is a result of the rapid growth in the scale of education, especially since World War II, and the concomitant lag in the development of adequate structures of control and coordination to take account of this growth. The foregoing constitutes one of the major obstacles to improved articulation. Another closely related obstacle is that of the myriad local and state laws, rules, regulations, and "guidelines," etc., which frequently conflict and hamper efforts to improve articulation. One of the first priorities of any state wishing to improve articulation within its own boundaries must be to cut through this knotty obstacle by urging the passage of appropriate legislation at the local and state levels and even possibly at the federal level and modifying its own rules and regulations accordingly.

Of all the major agencies of school-college articulation listed above, students and certain special interest groups, such as disadvantaged minorities, the elderly, the retired, working adults, etc., have had the least influence and power. Knoell and Medsker and Kintzer, among others, strongly emphasize that successful articulation must be based on the needs and interests of students. Direct student involvement and input into all or almost all phases of the articulation process is thus crucially necessary. Lack of such participation and input must be seen as one of the major deficiencies of most past and present articulation practices and programs and as a major obstacle to improvements in the future. Needless to say, disadvantaged minority groups and other special interest groups must also be given adequate participation, input, and power in any future efforts to improve articulation.

H. MAJOR OBSTACLES TO SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION

1. Attitudes of high school administrators
2. Attitudes of college administrators
3. Attitudes of high school faculty
4. Attitudes of college faculty
5. Attitudes of high school and college students
6. Public attitudes
7. Attitudes of local school board members
8. Attitudes of college trustees
9. Attitudes of political representatives
10. Attitudes of state-level educational leaders
11. Local and state rules, regulations, and laws
12. High school and college collective bargaining agencies.

Discussion:

The secondary school and the college, although at least partially combined at one time,[9] have evolved into distinctly unequal and independent systems, sharing little beyond the students that pass through both. Throughout most of our history college has been reserved largely for the elite, with grammar school and later the high school seen as the logical terminus for the mass of students. The history of school-college relations has been one characterized by the domination of the colleges via admissions requirements, insisting that the curriculum of the schools be almost exclusively college preparatory. The advent of mass higher education since World War II did not immediately change this situation, as high school faculty continued to react under the battle cry of "college domination."[10]

In the present era of mass education, one would expect that the old elitist distinctions between high school and college would be drastically reduced. Such, however, is not the case. High school faculty, even those holding doctorates, still occupy a much lower status than college faculty, with each group having its stereotype of the opposite caste. To ask many college faculty to work closely with high school faculty is akin to asking a Brahman to eat with an Untouchable. A real and significant status gap still exists between the two groups, including the administrators in both systems, with many negative feelings and attitudes on both sides. An additional present factor which strongly mitigates against cooperation in articulation between faculty in the two systems is the opposition of collective bargaining agencies on both sides, who view articulation as a device to reduce faculty.

---

[9] David Riesman and Christopher Jencks, The Academic Revolution, New York: Doubleday, 1968, pp. 29-30.

[10] Board of Education of the City of New York, Report on Articulation Between the High Schools and the Municipal Colleges of New York City, New York, 1950, p.1.

In _Continuity and Discontinuity_, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education discusses a number of additional factors which also hinder effective school-college cooperation:

1. The missions of the two systems have not always been the same.
2. School faculty distrust the academic elitism of the colleges.
3. College faculty are critical of the anti-intellectualism of the schools.
4. School faculty and administrators are more pragmatic in their approach to problem-solving than their college counterparts.
5. The schools emphasize teaching, while the colleges are oriented toward more theoretical and research interests.
6. Sex Stereotyping: School faculty tend to be female and college faculty male.
7. Political Ideology: School faculty tend to be moderately conservative and college faculty liberal.
8. Administrative Structure and Style: The school system is much more hierarchal, with administrators making most of the decisions, while colleges and universities tend to be characterized by "participatory democracy," in which individual faculty members retain much more control over the conditions of their employment.

The Commission concludes that, "Given these differences, the wonder is that any collaboration takes place."[11] Added to the foregoing list should be the important and basic legal distinctions between the two systems, both in terms of the sources of control and the influences operating on them. Pearson is doubtless correct in maintaining that this demarcation is "seemingly permanent."[12]

No one has yet conducted any large-scale studies designed specifically to determine attitudes toward articulation on the part of students, the public, local school board members, college trustees, etc., but we may assume that all of the groups listed view college as distinctly different from high school. The mythology surrounding "college education" promises all sorts of wondrous things; it is still the great highway leading to the "good life." Despite the oft-quoted loss of confidence in higher education, true believers still exist in sufficient numbers to fill a goodly number of campuses and willingly pay high fees for the privilege. One does not tamper with a belief system so strongly held as this without encountering strong resistance from the faithful. Since effective and large-scale articulation practices and programs inevitably act to blur the traditional distinctions between high school and college, we must expect strong opposition from many quarters.

---

[11] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Continuity and Discontinuity: Higher Education and the Schools, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973, pp. 101-102.

[12] Richard Pearson, "The Changing School and College Relationship," Journal of General Education, v. 17, April 1965, p. 1.

III. BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE

A. A SHORT HISTORY OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION IN THE UNITED STATES

> All waste is due to isolation. Organization is nothing but getting things into connection with one another, so that they work easily, flexibly and fully. Therefore, in speaking of this question of waste in education, I desire to call your attention to the isolation of the various parts of the school system, to the lack of unity in the administration of education, to the lack of coherence in its studies and methods.[1] ... The great problem in education on the administrative side is how to unite these different parts.[2]
>
> John Dewey, 1899

> It may be less that the secondary schools had one mission and the colleges had another than that the missions and goals of both were always mixed, always hard to figure out, and therefore always hard for the individual student, particularly the poor or immigrant student with bad advice, to contend with successfully. And it may be that the problem historically has been to make the full range of both systems known (and available) to everyone who ought to have access to them, or, put another way, to articulate the various segments of the two systems more effectively, or, put yet another way, to make what is becoming more and more an infinitely variegated single system (or what ought to be a single system) more rational and negotiable.[3]
>
> Lawrence Cremin, 1973

The quotations above are cited to give emphasis to the age of the problems involved in school-college articulation. Most of us too easily forget that our educational system is one that has grown like Topsy, picking up bits and pieces from England and Europe and inventing some of

---

[1] John Dewey, The School and Society, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1899, p. 78.

[2] Ibid., p. 84.

[3] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Continuity and Discontinuity: Higher Education and the Schools, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973, p. 13.

our own, such as the "high school."[4] The history of our education system has been aptly characterized by John Dale Russell as exhibiting "inco-ordination" between its segments or units.[5] From the end of the nineteenth century to the present, we can plot increased efforts at the state, regional, and national levels to bring order to this chaos, both in terms of defining the goals of each segment and in bringing about as much systematic coordination within and between segments as possible in an effort to achieve both a high level of quality and efficiency in the enterprise as a whole.

Perhaps the best place to obtain a concise, comprehensive, and up-to-date review of the historical development of American school-college relations and articulation is the 1973 Carnegie Report, Continuity and Discontinuity.[6] Based on a typology developed by Martin Trow,[7] the report divides the development of American secondary and higher education into four phases:

Phase I: The Search for a Coordinated System, 1870-1910
Phase II: The Schools Response to Industrial America, 1910-1940
Phase III: Mass Higher Education, 1940-1970
Phase IV: Universal-Access Higher Education, 1970-2000[8]

---

[4] Judd and Russell, The American Educational System, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1940, p. 229.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc.cit.

[7] Martin Trow, "The Second Transformation of American Secondary Education," International Journal of Comparative Sociology, vol. 2, September, 1961.

[8] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc.cit.

The description of each of the foregoing phases in the pages that follow is a largely paraphrased summary of the material found in the Carnegie Report cited above and interested readers are encouraged to consult this document directly for greater detail and depth.

Phase I: The Search for a Coordinated System, 1870-1910[9]

The rise of public secondary schools after the Civil War resulted both in an increase in the number of secondary schools and the students attending them. Both the secondary schools and the colleges of the period offered a narrow traditional curriculum to a small minority of youth. Because of the increased number of secondary schools and the volume of students, schools and colleges found that the common nineteenth century practice of each college preparing and administering its own entrance examinations was no longer adequate to the needs of the time. Many colleges responded by at first accrediting those secondary schools from which the bulk of their students were drawn. It soon became apparent, however, that some kind of regional or statewide remedy was needed. The answer came in the form of regional accreditation of secondary schools and regional college entrance examinations.

While systematizing the admissions process, this also had the unfortunate result of the colleges dominating the curriculum of the schools, forcing it into an academic and classical mold. While bringing about closer ties between the two systems, regional accreditation of secondary schools and regional college entrance examinations forced the bulk of the responsibility in college admissions on the schools. It was not entirely a one-way street, however, as these same practices helped to protect the secondary schools and students from the caprice of individual colleges and universities. Pearson notes, for example, that in at least two regions of the country - those represented by the North Central Association and the Middle States Association - the new regional procedures were the direct result of agitation and pressure by the secondary schools forced on reluctant colleges and universities. In both of these cases participation of the secondary schools was on a much more equal basis with their college brethren. The procedures used by both associations were based on the accreditation of secondary schools, the former using in addition the certification of individual students by the high school principal, while the latter utilized external entrance examinations.[10]

---

[9] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc.cit.

Phase I: Key Developments, 1870-1910

1871 - University of Michigan accredits secondary schools in its region. Practice then spread throughout the West.

1885 - Regional accreditation first established by the founding of The New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Similar associations developed within the next ten years in the Middle Atlantic States, the South, and the Midwest.

1893 - Committee of Ten of the National Education Association (NEA) defines the subject matter of college preparatory courses.

1899 - NEA's Committee on College Entrance Requirements further defines the subject matter of secondary schools necessary for college admission. (These requirements have remained largely in force up to the present time in many colleges.)

1900 - College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) was established for the evaluation and enforcement of standards in college preparatory curricula. CEEB examination results quickly became acceptable for admission to colleges and universities in the Middle Atlantic States and New England.

---

[10] Richard Pearson, "The Changing School and College Relationship," Journal of General Education, v. 17, April 1965, p. 2.

1906 - Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Education affirm the position of the NEA committee in 1899, resulting in the adoption of the unit system. "Over the years, the Carnegie unit system became one of the major stumbling blocks to better and more flexible educational programs in schools and colleges."[11]

Phase II: The Schools' Response to Industrial America, 1910-1940[12]

Secondary school enrollments increased dramatically during the period 1910-1940, while college enrollments increased to a much smaller degree. The schools now served the vast majority of youth, while the colleges continued to serve a relatively small elite. High school was now seen as the logical terminus for the mass of students and as a preparation for "life," rather than a way-station on the path to higher education. Secondary schools attempted to restructure their curriculum in terms of their new clientele and functions and found the colleges' insistence that the curriculum remain almost wholly college preparatory increasingly irritating. Because of the foregoing factors, the schools and colleges tended to pull apart in the areas of admissions and curriculum, as well as in other areas, each turning attention inward to their own problems. Thus, the trend toward closer ties developing between 1870-1910 was reversed and by 1940 there were severe strains between the two systems.

---

[11] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 14.

[12] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., pp. 17-22.

The colleges changed very little during this period, while the secondary schools underwent far-reaching changes. The innovations inspired by the Progressive education movement had profound effects upon both the schools and the teachers. Educational psychology had come of age and attacked many of the myths surrounding the teaching-learning process and helped pave the way for basic changes in the traditional curriculum. The introduction of "scientific" psychological measurement, leading to the development of tests of mental ability, also had significant effects, with the use of I.Q. and aptitude tests spreading rapidly after World War I. The Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) was first used in 1926 and first offered by the College Entrance Examination Board in 1937.

The comprehensive high school became fully developed during the 1930's, serving the vast majority of youth, most of whom did not go on to college. According to Richard Pearson, past president of the College Entrance Examination Board, the old external subject-matter entrance examinations of the Board were criticized by the schools as restricting their freedom to develop curricula suited to the needs of the majority of students. As a result, in 1941 the old entrance examinations were discarded and replaced by the present Scholastic Aptitude and Achievement Tests.[13,14] The use of the new tests was crucial in opening up college for the flood of young people to come after World War II, because they tested ability rather than the knowledge of specific course content. It was soon discovered that the

---

[13] Richard Pearson, "The Critical Four Years," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 51, May, 1967, pp. 121-122.

[14] Richard Pearson, loc. cit., p. 4.

new tests predicted college performance (grades) just as well as the old essay exams. The new tests dealt a severe blow to the traditional prescribed curriculum and elitist admissions policies and opened the way for the meritocratic admissions policies of the present. By the 1940's, secondary school accreditation extended beyond college preparation to "include this new comprehensive mission of the secondary school."[15]

No adequate description of this period in educational history can conclude without discussing the famous Eight-Year Study (1932-1940).[16] This was a major experiment for the time, involving the cooperation of 30 schools and 300 colleges in allowing the schools to experiment in curricular changes without penalty to their students in college admission. The major conclusion of the study was that success in college was not related to the study of specific subjects for a given length of time in high school. The study was yet another blow to the traditional curriculum and rigid admissions policies. Its importance in the history of American school-college articulation cannot be overemphasized. It represents the first large-scale cooperative study of school-college articulation, involving schools and colleges in various parts of the U. S. Nothing like it has been done since. The problems examined and the language used have a distinctly contemporary ring. It could doubtless be published today, with a few minor changes, and be accepted as "a brilliant description of the current school-college articulation scene."

---

[15] Ibid., p. 3.

[16] Wilford M. Aikin, The Story of the Eight-Year Study, New York: Harper, 1942.

Phase III: Mass Higher Education, 1940-1970[17]

Mass higher education became a reality between 1940-1970, with college enrollments more than trebling by 1970. The influx of veterans in the 1940's was witness to the fact that the colleges had now begun to serve large numbers of students from a broad range of middle class backgrounds. By 1970, large numbers of disadvantaged and minority students were being served as well. The function of the secondary school changed from mass terminal education to mass college preparation. The schools continued, however, to be more concerned with their own programs, while an increasing proportion of students looked toward college. The colleges, likewise, remained concerned with their own problems and so the two systems largely remained apart.

The Commission's statement that "It can be argued that the schools changed less and the colleges more as they broadened their curricula to meet the diversity of student abilities and interests "[18] will doubtless be challenged by those who feel that there is much evidence to support an obverse conclusion.[19] Changes in the curricula of the colleges reflected the need for larger numbers of white collar and professional workers in the transition from a manufacturing economy to a service economy. Curricular changes in most colleges, while significant, consisted mainly in the addition of new professional programs to the traditional liberal arts core, which remained largely intact under the watchful eyes of the faithful. The dramatic growth in junior/community colleges in many respects signalled a much more profound change in higher education and was a harbinger of what was yet to come. Anyone who doubts this might ponder the fact that community college enrollments in 1972 were equal to the total enrollment in all institutions of higher education in 1945 and that as of the fall term 1970, 41% of all freshmen were enrolled in community colleges.[20]

---

[17] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, pp. 22-28.

[18] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, p. 22.

[19] Elizabeth W. Haven, "Curricular Innovation & Practices in the American High School," School and Society, v. 98, no. 2325, April 1970, p. 239.

The changes taking place in the traditional 4-year colleges in admissions, curriculum, teaching methods, advisement, and so on were superficial when compared to the changes that had taken place in the secondary schools in the preceding period, 1910-1940. The lack of long overdue changes in the colleges in these areas was abruptly brought to national attention by the student protest movement of the 1960's. It has only been since then that most colleges have made major efforts to change. It has not been until now, well into the 1970's, that we finally find ourselves witnessing major changes in higher education. The causes of such a long lag in bringing about such needed changes doubtless lie more in the realm of economics than in ideology or tradition. The period 1940-1970 was a seller's market and the colleges didn't have to change to attract students. The present period of shrinking undergraduate enrollments, especially in the liberal arts, and public demands for improved quality and efficiency have created another ballgame.

---

[20] Frederick C. Kintzer, Middleman in Higher Education, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973, p. vii & p. xi.

The current ferment for change in higher education is comparable in many respects to the ferment during the 1950's for changes in the high school. Both periods were characterized by a conservative backlash on education as a whole. Cold War psychology following World War II and the paranoia induced by MaCarthyism led to the widespread conviction that Progressive education had seriously weakened our schools. The first Sputnik in 1957 gave credence to those who claimed that our schools were inferior to those of the U.S.S.R..

James B. Conant's The American High School Today[21] in 1958 was widely read and accepted as a guide to improving the comprehensive high school. The massive reform movement that got underway was a largely conservative one in that the two major foci of change were in the improvement of the quality of education and a concentration upon the academically gifted. Many programs were initiated to achieve these goals. Among the most notable of those were the Advanced Placement Program of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), the National Merit Scholarship Program, and the creation of the National Science Foundation, which spent millions of dollars in sponsoring a plethora of experimental programs and research studies to upgrade the quality of the schools. The results of these efforts led to major changes in the curricula of the schools, especially in the areas of math, science, and foreign languages.

The curricular changes in the secondary schools triggered in the 1950's have continued into the present. Haven suggests that more changes occurred in the curriculum of the secondary schools between 1960 and 1970 than in any previous decade in our history.[22] The long-standing and oft-noted overlap between high school and college curricula has reached major proportions as more and more of what has traditionally been considered to be college-level work is offered in the high school.

---

[21] James B. Conant, The American High School Today, New York: McGraw Hill, 1959.

In concluding this discussion of Phase III, it is important to note that efforts at school-college coordination/articulation during this period became more and more a concern for the federal government, state education departments, educational foundations, professional educational associations, regional accrediting agencies, and external testing agencies. Mass higher education had created the necessity for a quantum leap in centralized control and coordination/articulation at the state, regional, and federal levels.

Phase IV: Universal Access to Higher Education, 1970-2000[23]

It is beyond the scope of the present study to review in detail all of the Commission's views and recommendations concerning the future of school-college relations to the year 2000. The Commission, quite properly, takes a much broader and comprehensive approach to this interface than that of the present more-limited study, which focuses more narrowly upon certain selected aspects in the context of practices and programs in New York State. What will be offered here, then, is but a brief review and commentary on those views and recommendations of the Commission that seem especially pertinent to the purposes of the present study.

---

[22] Haven, loc. cit.

[23] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., pp. 27-110.

The Commission believes that universal access to higher education in the period 1970-2000 will be primarily achieved via community colleges with open-admissions policies. Universal access will mean that the schools and colleges will be forced to work more closely together in order to achieve continuity in the education of students coming from diverse backgrounds, of widely differing ages, and having a wide range of ambitions, interests, and goals. While favoring some discontinuity between school and college as being beneficial, the Commission urges that harmful and wasteful discontinuities be eliminated wherever possible. The approach taken by the Commission is a many-pronged attack on the problem and implies participation from all sectors involved. Not only the schools and colleges will be involved, but state education departments, accrediting agencies, testing agencies, foundations, and so on.

In discussing the future of school-college relations, the Commission examines five aspects of the relationship and makes recommendations concerning each:

1. Reform in the Admissions Process[24]

   a) Admissions Requirements:

   Recommendation 5: "Colleges should review their admissions requirements and except for competence in the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic should not require or suggest particular courses of study at the secondary level unless such requirements or suggestions are tied explicitly to the colleges' own degree requirements, or to those of the system of which they are a part."[25]

---

[24] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., pp. 41-52.

[25] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 43.

As we have seen in reviewing the history of school-college relations, college admissions requirements have served as a major barrier to improved articulation between the two systems. The colleges have used admissions requirements as a weapon to dictate the curricula of the schools. Since universal access to higher education will result in a highly heterogeneous student population in terms of ages, abilities, career goals, and backgrounds, college programs must be likewise diverse. There can no longer be, as the Commission puts it, an agreed-upon college preparatory curriculum.

In addition to the foregoing, the Commission believes that a "new look" is necessary in college admissions requirements for three reasons:

(1) High schools attempting to experiment with their curricula are hampered by college admissions requirements which take up most of the student's time.

(2) Traditional degree requirements in the college curriculum are being modified or eliminated.

(3) Credit by examination is increasingly common at the college level. The trend is to award credit on the basis of what the student knows in a given subject area, rather than on how many courses he has had over a given number of years. Colleges are therefore no longer justified in requiring high school students to complete a set number of years of study in certain subjects. The only exception to the foregoing is mathematics, which the Commission believes should be studied sequentially throughout high school, since an increasing number of fields require a basic competence in math.[26]

---

[26] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 43.

b) Testing:

> Recommendation 7: "Colleges should closely examine their admissions policies with respect to sex, race, and age. They should then be certain that their admissions practices implement those policies that relate to social justice in higher education. Separate predictive equations for men and women, minority students, and adults should be developed and, where feasible, differential prediction by general field of study should be used."[27]

> Recommendation 8: "Testing agencies should initiate the development of a family of admissions and placement tests, with special versions prepared for individuals with particular educational and career aspirations."[28]

The three major college testing agencies - The College Board, Educational Testing Service, and the American College Testing Program - have played a major role in expanding educational opportunities for many students who would otherwise not have been able to attend college. There is little doubt that the role of testing will greatly increase in the years ahead because of the growing diversity of students and programs at both the school and college levels.

In recent years the "tests" have been severely criticized for, among other things, being unfair to minority students, measuring only a narrow range of abilities, neglecting and/or penalizing creativity, and restricting school and college curricula. The testing agencies have been very much concerned with these criticisms and are actively engaged in conducting the necessary research which will, hopefully, correct these deficiencies through the development of new tests and/or the modification of the present tests. From their inception, these agencies have played a prominent and laudable role, not only in the testing aspects of college admissions, but also in exploring the more basic problems involved in school-college articulation.

---

[27] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 46.

[28] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 46.

The Commission feels that the present family of college admissions tests do indeed emphasize only a narrow range of abilities - cognitive ability, reading ability, and mathematical ability - and that this constitutes one of the most pressing problems confronting the schools, colleges, and the testing agencies. While the abilities now tested for are directly related to success in traditional college courses and eventual success in graduate or professional school, they are unfair to students who have other abilities or who wish to pursue careers requiring other abilities. As the college curricula shifts to meet the needs of these students, it will be necessary to develop new tests which will measure abilities such as "sensitivity to others," "interpersonal skills," creativity, and so on.

c) Counseling:

> Recommendation 9: "Schools, colleges, and testing agencies should work together in developing a complete and coherent information system that enables sound decision making by both students and colleges. Colleges should prepare frank, accurate, and complete descriptive materials, so that students will know as much about colleges as the colleges know about students."[29]

Since universal access mass education will bring with it both an increasing diversity of students and diversity of programs to meet their needs, the problems involved in counseling-guidance from kindergarten on will assume major proportions. From the students' point of view, accurate information and lots of it will be necessary to make the many crucial and difficult decisions concerning choice of programs and career goals. Counseling, then, will in many respects be the keystone of the universal access mass education edifice of the future, and its potential weakest link. It is surprising, therefore, that the Commission did not give counseling greater importance relative to other areas.

---

[29] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 49.

Few would disagree with the Commission's statement that guidance services are "notoriously weak" at the high school level. There are too few counselors and a lack of adequate counselor training in the areas of college and career guidance. Students are almost completely dependent upon the counselor for advice because of the student's lack of ready access to accurate and pertinent information concerning colleges and career choices. In response to the latter problem, the College Board, Educational Testing Service, and the American College Testing Program have been engaged for some years in developing information-guidance systems to aid the student in making a choice of both a college and a career.

While sharply critical of high school counseling, the Commission appears to be insufficiently critical of the colleges in terms of the quality and accuracy of the information they provide via catalogs and brochures. The damage done to students in terms of lives and dollars, who have been misled by college catalogs and brochures is hard to assess, but doubtless considerable. Instead of the wrist-slap the Commission deals out, it would seem that greater regulation by state education departments to insure honesty in college advertising via guidelines with teeth might do much to discourage the excesses of college advertising in recent years.

For some reason, the Commission pays but scant attention to counseling at the college level, which is equally as bad as, if not worse than, that received in the high schools. It would appear that the Commission implicitly assumes or is recommending, without a rationale or supporting evidence, that almost all counseling at the school-college interface be done in the schools, with little participation by the colleges. If true, such a position is open to much criticism, since it appears to deny an integrated and contiguous school-college counseling system. The Commission makes only two recommendations directly concerning counseling at the college level.[30] They suggest that high school students might be given more adequate counseling by being tutored through a variety of resources, such as community-based people and college students. In addition, it is suggested that admissions officers receive more formal training and that greater importance be assigned to their work.

d) Experimentation:

> Recommendation 12: "In those areas where multiple college applications are a problem, clearinghouse operations utilizing single application forms, transcripts, and school report forms should be developed. Concern for the small amount of college autonomy involved should be less important than better service to the students."[31]
>
> Recommendation 13: "Experimentation with college admissions practices should be encouraged. In particular, more experimentation is needed to determine the quality of testing as a basis for admission and placement, the importance of student motivation and life experience as indicators of promise, and the feasibility of deferred admissions as a means of providing educational flexibility for students."[32]

Hardly anyone would disagree with the Commission's characterization of the admissions process as being "time consuming, expensive, and often nerve-wracking and exhausting for all concerned..."[33] Since most students apply to a number of colleges, this usually requires the filling out of an equivalent number of application forms and the submission of transcripts and recommendations from the secondary school to each college applied to. If the student is applying for financial aid, the process becomes even more complicated. One of the best sources for a grasp of the range of difficulties and needless hurdles encountered by the student in the admissions process is a recent report of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.[34] The recommendations contained in this report complement those of the Commission and should be read in conjunction with the latter.

---

[30] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 49.

[31] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 52.

[32] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 52.

[33] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 49.

The admissions process is a prime example of the organizational lag characteristic of the whole of the present school-college interface. When few went to college and when colleges were small, it made more sense to proceed in such a manner. In the present era of mass higher education and computer-based technology, however, the survival of such an inefficient process has become dysfunctional for all concerned.

A systems approach to the admissions process as a delivery system would do much to correct some of the deficiencies noted above. Some of the more obvious outcomes of such an approach would be common application forms, clearinghouse operations, common school report forms, and central processing of all forms. Within the State University of New York (SUNY), for example, 46 of the 72 campuses now participate in a common application program which includes a common set of application procedures and requirements coordinated by a central application processing center (APC),

---

[34] Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, "Recommended School/College Articulation Practices," School and College News, vol. 2, no. 2, January, 1973.

"which receives, processes, and forwards all applications to the various campuses, where the individual admissions decisions are made."[35] Other states have similar programs under development.

Most of the difficulties in the admissions process are bookkeeping problems and do not involve basic questions of educational values or goals. As the Commission aptly points out, the only thing threatened is the dubious value of institutional autonomy in completely determining admissions policies and practices. The loss of a certain amount of such autonomy would seem to be a small price to pay for major improvements in the admissions process for all concerned.

2. Improvement in Secondary Education[36]

a) Overlapping of School-College Curricula:

Like the colleges, the schools are embroiled in the issues and problems involved in the transition to universal access mass higher education. One of the most frequent assertions concerning the school-college interface is that today's high school graduates know more than they did a decade ago. The Commission cautions that there is little hard data to support this assertion and that the extant data is equivocal in interpretation. There does, however, seem to be little doubt that because of the upgrading of high school curricula since the 1950's, much of what was once taught in college is now taught in high school. This has resulted in much overlapping of high school and college curricula, with students forced to repeat or duplicate work already taken.

---

[35] Information and Application for Admission to the University 1974, State University of New York, 1974, p. 3.

[36] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., pp. 53-77.

b) Problem of Inner-City Schools and the Role of Higher Education:

> Recommendation 15: "Improvement of the nation's schools is the first educational priority in the nation; and within the schools improvement in the basic skills, especially in large city schools, is the first priority. Colleges and universities should recognize this fact and help to provide the resources, incentives, and rewards for faculty members who commit themselves to this task."[37]

One of the biggest problems involved in the school-college interface is the great disparity in quality between high schools. While there are many truly distinguished high schools, both public and private, offering programs which are superior to much that is offered during the first year of college, there are many more, primarily big-city high schools, which offer abysmally low quality programs.[38] As the Commission notes, the reading disabilities of elementary and junior high school students in New York City has become so marked as to cause the New York State Board of Regents to appoint a special task force to seek a solution to the problem.

Another problem faced by many inner-city schools is the lack of adequate vocational training. Students not suited to the academic curriculum are shunted into a "watered-down" "general curriculum." The Fleischman Commission in New York recommended the abolition of the "general curriculum," since it was clearly not serving the needs of students.

The Commission believes that the colleges can and should play a vital role in helping the high schools overcome the academic disabilities of students from poor quality inner-city schools. Some colleges are already engaged in or planning programs specifically directed toward meeting this goal. In New York City, for example, both John Jay College of Criminal

---

[37] Ibid., p. 67.

[38] Pearson, loc. cit., p. 6.

Justice and LaGuardia Community College, both units of The City University of New York (CUNY), are planning novel programs. John Jay College of Criminal Justice is planning to operate its own high school, which will offer both terminal and college preparatory programs for students interested in law enforcement careers. La Guardia Community College has plans to enroll a sizable number of high school students who have completed their sophomore year in the hope of providing earlier motivation and remediation plus the option of engaging in a cooperative work study program with local business and industry. Perhaps these two programs in New York City and others like them elsewhere are an indication of what will, hopefully, become a national trend in closer school-college articulation. As the Commission notes, these programs are a return full-cycle to the common nineteenth century practice of college-run preparatory schools.[39]

c) General Education:

> Recommendation 16: "Each state should undertake a review and analysis of the general education requirements for graduation from high school. Objectives should be clearly established and new means to these objectives should be explored, including the possibility that students can "test out" of graduation requirements. In addition, the relationship of general education at the high school to that at the college level, especially in grades 13 and 14, should be explored with a view toward ways that the general education requirements at both levels might be linked together to provide continuity and to prevent wasteful overlap and duplication. School and college faculty members should work together on this set of problems under the sponsorship of local, state, and national organizations such as the College Board and professional associations. More of the responsibility for general education should be assumed by the high schools."[40]

---

[39] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 66.

[40] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., pp. 69-70.

The Commission's recommendation on general education is difficult to fault. The arguments offered center on the fact that our current general education requirements are a carryover from the early 1900's and reflect the goals and objectives of elitist education of the few. Universal access mass education requires that we restructure such requirements to meet the needs of the diverse clientele we now serve.

d) Vocational Education:

> Recommendation 17: "Each state through its coordinating mechanisms should study carefully and define the roles of public high schools, area vocational schools, community colleges, and proprietary schools with respect to vocational and technical programs."[41]

The Commission's major concern here is with the serious lack of articulation among the manifold vocational programs offered in various kinds of institutional settings at both the high school and college levels. Vocational education and especially "career education" is now the "in" thing in higher education of the 1970's, while the liberal arts and sciences languish. The usual explanation given for this is that the present tight economic situation has resulted in a temporary shortage of white-collar jobs for college graduates. Stephen Dresch, among others, notes that although the present economic situation is certainly a significant factor, a much more significant factor is the real decline in the number of top-level white-collar managerial and professional jobs available to college graduates. The "exploding" college population of the 1960's met the labor market's demand for the college-educated and since then the demand has decreased. Today's college graduates are being forced to take jobs further down in the social and vocational structure; "they are becoming the middle-echelon workers."[42]

---

[41] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 71.

e) New Methods and Resources:

> Recommendation 20: "Schools and colleges alike should remember that experimentation carries with it the price of accountability. No new programs at either level should be initiated without clear criteria for evaluation."[43]

While encouraging experimentation with the many teaching-learning methods and resources now being used in the secondary schools, the Commission believes there should be built-in criteria for evaluation. Among the many promising practices now being used is that of the external high school diploma. The Commission cites the recently developed Regional Learning Service (RLS) of Central New York which is a consortium of schools and colleges in an eleven-county area administered by the Syracuse Research Corporation. It is open to people of all ages and educational backgrounds who wish to earn high school diplomas or college degrees. Credit is awarded for demonstrated academic competence based on life experience and studies conducted outside normal school and college programs. As described by the Commission, the proposed program consists of two parts: (1) "The first is the provision of extensive counseling services and learning options through existing educational and community resources." (2) "The second is the development of the Regents External High School Diploma, which will introduce more flexibility and individuality in curriculum content and assessment than currently is the case with either the local high school diploma or the New York State Equivalency Diploma."[44]

---

[42] Stephen Dresch, The Emory Magazine, vol. 50, no. 6, July 1974, p. 3.

[43] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 77.

[44] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., pp. 76-77.

f) Other Recommendations of the Commission:

(1) Curriculum development in the humanities and social studies:

Recommendation 18: "Curriculum development in the humanities and social studies has lagged behind mathematics and science. Schools and colleges, together with funding agencies, should foster new programs and approaches."[45]

(2) Textbooks and other teaching materials:

Recommendation 19: "The Carnegie Commission recommends a major national study of the entire set of relationships that exists between school systems, state bureaucracies, school and college teachers, and the educational materials industry in the production and selection of materials. The purpose of the study would be to seek ways to improve the system by which curricular materials are chosen, created, and marketed. Such a study should shed light as well upon the difficulties and problems associated with the widespread adoption of educational technology."[46]

3. New Structural Patterns

Recommendation 21: "Schools and colleges should experiment with different structural models designed to provide a student with options that will enable him to find the right program at the right time. Such experimentation challenges the current structure and its traditional break between school and college at the end of grade 12. Liberal arts colleges should consider enrolling students as early as grade 11 and awarding the bachelor's degree after grade 14 or 15; there should be experimentation with public education at age 4; some school systems should eliminate a year from the K through 12 sequence; other school systems should stress general education equivalent to that found at good colleges; students should be able to "test out" of high school graduation requirements; there should be expanded programs of college credit for the senior year of high school, concurrent enrollment of students in school and college, and early admission to college; options other than college attendance should be made available for high school graduates."[48]

---

[45] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 73.

[46] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 74.

[47] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., pp. 79-83.

[48] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 83.

The Commission believes that besides curricular restructuring, i.e., course revision and new content, experimentation with the structure of education at the school-college interface is required to achieve a better transition between the two systems. The thrust of the Commission's recommendations in this area is on time-shortening and greater options for the student.[49] Even a casual observer must note that time-shortening in its various forms is now the "in" thing all across the country. Equally apparent is the fact that many schools have opted for time-shortening as a recruiting device to bolster sagging enrollments.

The Commission describes a number of possibilities for experimenting with structural changes in the school-college interface:

1. Shortening the 13 year K-12 sequence by:

   a. commencing school at age 4.
   b. reduction to 12 years, while maintaining quality.
   c. high school students test out of graduation requirements in order to go to college early or to stop out for a year of work or service. The Commission recommends that General Educational Development tests (GED) be made available to high school students who wish to graduate early.

2. School-College Cooperation:

   a. high school students provided with a curriculum that most good colleges would consider the equivalent of its lower-division education program
   b. college credit for senior year at high school via: (1) certification by regional accrediting agencies; (2) testing-advanced placement and CLEP
   c. concurrent high school and college enrollment
   d. early admissions.

3. Time-Shortened College Programs:

   a. 3-year baccalaureate programs
   b. accelerated programs

---

[49] See Carnegie Commission Report - Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond The High School, January, 1971.

4. Middle Colleges - grades 11 through 14 and offering a baccalaureate degree.

5. More Options for High School Graduates: In Recommendation 21, the Commission asks that both schools and colleges provide the student with more options, both curricular and otherwise, so that he may find a program suited to his particular needs. Included in these options should be some that do not require college attendance, since the Commission is much concerned about the large number of students now attending college who would be happier and better-served elsewhere.[50]

4. The Education of School Teachers and Administrators[51]

In Recommendations 22-27, the Commission indicates various means and methods whereby present deficiencies in the education of school teachers and administrators that bear on some of the major problems at the school-college interface may be eliminated. Although consideration of this area is certainly significant in treating the larger context in which school-college articulation takes place, it is beyond the more limited scope of the present investigation and therefore shall not be dealt with here.

5. Mechanisms for School-College Collaboration[52]

Recommendation 28: "Colleges and universities should encourage school-college collaboration on substantive matters through promotion and reward policies that recognize the importance of such activities."[53]

Recommendation 29: "Though often different in temperament, training, and style, school and college teachers and administrators must work together to reduce many of the present undesirable discontinuities in the relationships between school and college."[54]

---

[50] See the forthcoming Carnegie Commission Report, Toward a Learning Society.

[51] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., pp. 85-100.

[52] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., pp. 101-108.

[53] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 103.

[54] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 108.

Recommendation 30: "Activities having to do with the substantive matters discussed in this report should be initiated by five different agencies: state education offices, educational institutions, testing agencies, foundations, and the federal government."[55]

The Commission believes that the traditional barriers between school and college preventing effective collaboration must be broken down, so that not only the faculty of education is involved, but the total faculty as well. While emphasizing that the two systems have had historically different missions and that a certain degree of discontinuity, indeed "tension," can be productive, the Commission urges closer collaboration to eliminate many of the harmful discontinuities that presently exist.

The Commission lists five common interests that demand closer ties in the era ahead:

(1) The need to make equality of educational opportunity a reality

(2) The challenge to traditional curricula and structure at both levels

(3) The necessity for response to public disenchantment with education at both levels

(4) The need to maximize the use of limited financial resources

(5) The unity of educational welfare must be recognized.

Harmful discontinuities between school and college are cited within the following areas:

(1) College admissions (between institutional interests and student interests)

(2) In the curricular interface

(3) In teacher education (between theory and on-the-job requirements)

---

[55] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 108.

(4) In educational research (between findings and applications)

(5) In political and financial relationships between schools and colleges.

Within the area of political and financial relationships, the Commission feels that the primary issue is that of state financial support, as the competition for funds between schools and colleges increases. Another important factor that must be taken into account is the impact of unionization of both school and college teachers. Statewide collective bargaining for both school and college teachers may become a reality in the years ahead. The Commission warns that unless the schools and colleges work closely together, the competition for funds may result in losses to both sectors and education generally.

The Commission suggests a number of mechanisms for improving the political and financial relationships between schools and colleges:

1. At the State Level:
   a. "State funding, whether by state boards of education or state boards of higher education, of joint school-college projects, for example, curriculum studies, experimentation with middle colleges, and other ideas that overlap the concerns of both school and college."
   b. "Informal and voluntary liaison between staffs of state boards of education and state boards of higher education."
   c. "Creation of joint budgetary review committees and/or planning committees drawn from state boards of education and state boards of higher education."
2. By Schools and Colleges:
   a. "Development of 'school relations' offices or strengthening of admission offices to enable closer contact with individual schools."

   b. "Curricular workshops on joint problems of articulation and placement."
   c. "Faculty exchanges between school and college."
   d. "Joint appointments in education and arts and sciences or other professional schools such as business, law, and public administration."
   e. "Clinical professorships or joint appointments in both college and local school systems."[56]

3. By Consortia of Schools and Colleges:
   a. At the institutional level
   b. University expertise brought to bear on school problems (such as consultation, research, teacher and administrator training, and curriculum development).

4. By Testing Agencies:
   a. "Working closely with schools and colleges in developing assessment programs."
   b. "Encouraging fresh ideas from school and college faculty members about new programs to meet the needs of universal access."
   c. "Exchanging their own personnel with schools and encouraging school-college exchange to assure greater mutual understanding of the problems and possibilities of combined efforts at innovation."

5. By the Federal Government and Foundations:
   a. "Ensuring school-college collaboration through funding patterns."
   b. "Channeling funds into school systems as well as colleges and testing agencies for work on school problems."[57]

---

[56] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., pp. 105-106.

[57] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit., p. 107.

B. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION IN NEW YORK STATE

> New York was thinking of a State System of schools when other states were only thinking about isolated schools, indeed, when other states were assuming that it would be an imperious and sad limitation upon liberty and democracy if any individual school lost any of its individuality in a system of schools, even though such a system was vital to its efficiency if not to its existence, to its power if not to its life.
>
> Commissioner of Education Andrew S.
> Draper, 1912

> It is this "oneness," this unity, this solidarity of structure, which is our great strength as we go forward in a new area of education in our State. The coordinated planning and action which are possible within a structure which encompasses all of education, form our great hope for meeting present-day needs in ways which will not only be effective now but will prove to be constructive parts of an orderly, productive pattern of growth.
>
> Commissioner of Education James E.
> Allen, 1956

The history of school-college articulation in New York State generally parallels the developments outlined in Phases I-IV for the nation as a whole. New York is unique among all the states, however, in its long commitment to a totally integrated and unified system of education, from kindergarten through graduate school, in which educational institutions of all types and levels are organized as part of one great institution: The University of the State of New York. Articulation both within and between the units of the State's system of education has thus been a central concern and issue for a very long time.[58]

---

[58] Most of the material for this section was obtained from the following two sources:

University of the State of New York, The New York State Education Department 1900-1965, Albany, New York, 1967.

Frank C. Abbott, Government Policy and Higher Education, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1958.

The University of the State of New York was founded in 1784 by action of the legislature, almost immediately after independence was achieved. The Board of Regents was established in the same year, making it the oldest and continuing board of education in the U. S. The concept of a complete and unified system of education, a "university" organized under state planning and control, was borrowed from ideas then current among French Enlightenment thinkers. Men such as Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and Ezra L'Hommedieu were much influenced by these ideas and were instrumental in turn in influencing other leaders in the State such as Governor George Clinton to establish such a system of education in the State.

Following the Revolutionary War, elementary education was open to all, subsidized in part by State and local taxation. Secondary schools (academies) and colleges, however, were almost entirely privately supported and controlled and reserved for the elite. This pattern did not change significantly until the middle of the 19th Century with the rise of public secondary education, while the situation in higher education remained largely the same until the end of World War II.

During the 19th Century there were two State educational authorities. The Board of Regents exercised control over the private academies, colleges, and universities, while the State Superintendent of Schools controlled elementary education. With the rise of the public high school after the Civil War, both authorities claimed control, the battle for jurisdiction continuing until the Unification Act of 1904. The Regents and the State Superintendent of Schools were combined and given complete control of all educational institutions through one institution, The University of the State of New York. The position of State Superintendent of Schools was now retitled State Commissioner of Education, who was designated as the chief executive officer of the Board of Regents and the chief administrative officer of the State Education Department. The division of powers and responsibilities between the Regents and the Commissioner of Education that has evolved since 1904 has been one in which the Regents act in a legislative capacity and the Commissioner in an executive capacity concerning all types and levels of education.

The Regents and the Commissioner of Education are legally responsible for all master planning including articulation between levels of education. Within the State Education Department, there is no special office or administrative position specifically devoted to articulation, neither school-college nor 2-year,4-year.

Articulation between schools and colleges in the State has historically been one of voluntary arrangements worked out between individual institutions, with little interference from the Regents or the State Education Department. The Department has, however, consistently encouraged better articulation at both the school-college juncture and the 2-year, 4-year juncture in recent years through the development of facilitating policies, sponsorship of conferences and review of program proposals.

As reported by Kintzer,[59] articulation between public two-year colleges and four-year institutions is in fact extensively developed throughout the State. "Improvements in articulation are effected in cooperation with the State University, City University, and the Commission of Private Colleges and Universities. The president of the latter organization and the chief executives of SUNY and CUNY, called chancellors, serve as an advisory board to the Commissioner of Education."[60]

---

[59] Frederick C. Kintzer, loc. cit., pp. 84-87.

As examples of 2-yr.-4-yr. articulation practices within the State:

1. The 1968 master plan of the State University guaranteed all graduates of 2-year programs within the State admission to a senior institution. Since 1968, SUNY has made much progress in implementing this provision of its master plan,
2. Within The City University of New York (CUNY), area community college students are given automatic transfer to one of the senior colleges,
3. Responses from the _1974 Regents Progress Report_ indicate that substantial progress is being made throughout the State in 2-yr.-4-yr. articulation within the private sector as well as the public sector.

In sum, articulation between 2-yr. and 4-yr. institutions within the State is well-developed and actively encouraged. SUNY and CUNY, in particular, appear to be leaders in this area, with extensive and systematic policies and programs. Especially encouraging is the increased emphasis upon regional articulation within the SUNY system.

At the school-college interface there is evidence of substantial and rapidly expanding efforts being made by a number of schools and colleges to improve articulation. At the policy level, the State Education Department has developed guidelines for Early Admission to College to facilitate transition from school to college. Recently, much interest and discussion have been stimulated by the recent Regents' position paper on school-college articulation.[61] It is hoped that the results of the present survey will further contribute to the healthy dialogue and debate both within and among all educational constituencies in the State.

---

[60] _Ibid._, p. 84.

As this brief historical sketch has tried to illustrate, school-college articulation is and always has been an integral part of New York's unique system of education. The Regents Statewide Plan For The Development of Postsecondary Education - 1972 (Education Beyond High School)[62] and the recent position paper of the Regents both give strong support to practices and programs of school-college articulation. More concretely, the Regents' support of school-college articulation can be illustrated by the many programs and innovations sponsored by the State Department of Education over the years, some of the more recent of which are covered in this paper. Last, but not least, Regents advisory groups on selected aspects of school-college articulation are being established, as called for in Regents Position Paper 21.

---

[61] University of the State of New York, The Articulation of Secondary and Postsecondary Education, Position Paper #21, Albany, New York, August 1974.

[62] State Education Department, loc. cit.

IV. RESULTS

A. DEGREE OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION BY ARTICULATION AREA AND MODE OF COOPERATION

Question I: "Estimate the overall extent to which your institution engages in cooperative practices in various areas of articulation and estimate whether such practices are structured in a mostly formal or informal manner."

1. Total Sample: (combined secondary and postsecondary institutions)

   a. Examination of the responses from the total sample of respondents indicates that Exit-Admissions is, by far, the area seen as having the greatest degree of articulation. It is followed by Academic Advisement, Curriculum, and Career Guidance, while Grading Practices was reported as exhibiting the lowest degree of articulation.

   b. One way of obtaining a measure of the overall articulation reported, is to take the Mean ($\bar{X}$) % of cooperation for all areas of articulation combined, with all modes of cooperation and estimated programmatic articulation combined for each area of articulation. This yields the following results: Overall Articulation:
   Much - 5% Some-Little - 40% None - 55%

   c. A measure of the overall estimated programmatic articulation reported is obtained by calculating the Mean ($\bar{X}$) % of estimated programmatic articulation by combining all areas of articulation. This yields the following results: Overall Estimated Programmatic Articulation:
   Much - 3% Some-Little - 53% None - 44%

   d. Comparison of the modes of cooperation for each area of articulation indicates that Information Exchange is, by far, the major mode of cooperation utilized, while Shared Physical Plant, Special Facilities, and Services is utilized least.

e. Most articulation practices and programs in all articulation areas are reported as largely informal (70%). Exit-Admissions and Curriculum appear to be slightly more formally organized than the remaining areas of articulation, while Personal and Social Counseling, Grading Practices, and Crediting Practices appear to be slightly more informally organized than the other areas.

f. There appears to be a positive correlation between the degree of estimated articulation in a given area and the estimated formality of the structure of the arrangements. This may be interpreted to mean, that, as the degree of school-college articulation in a given area of articulation increases, there is a tendency for the structure of the arrangements made to become more formally organized.

TABLE 3

TOTAL SAMPLE: MEAN % OF ESTIMATED SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION BY ARTICULATION AREA, COMBINING ALL MODES OF COOPERATION AND ESTIMATED DEGREE OF PROGRAMMATIC ARTICULATION (N=216)

Articulation Area	$\bar{X}$ % of Cooperation (all modes combined)		
	Much	Some-Little	None
A. Exit-Admissions	15	53	32
B. Academic Advisement	8	48	44
C. Curriculum	7	49	44
D. Teaching Methods	1	32	67
E. Grading Practices	1	21	78
F. Crediting Practices	2	36	62
G. Remediation	2	31	67
H. Career Guidance	5	50	45
I. Counseling	3	37	60
Overall $\bar{X}$%	5	40	55

TABLE 4

TOTAL SAMPLE: MEAN % OF ESTIMATED SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION BY MODE OF ARTICULATION AND PROGRAMMATIC ARTICULATION, COMBINING ALL AREAS OF ARTICULATION (N=216)

Mode of Articulation	$\bar{X}$ % of Cooperation (Articulation) Much	 Some-Little	 None
Information Exchange	15	51	34
Decision-Making	4	41	55
Evaluation	3	38	59
Shared Personnel	2	36	62
Shared Facilities-Services	2	29	69
Overall $\bar{X}$% =	5	39	56
Programmatic Articulation	3	53	44

TABLE 5

TOTAL SAMPLE: MEAN % OF ESTIMATED INFORMAL VS. FORMAL STRUCTURES IN ARTICULATION PRACTICES BY AREA OF ARTICULATION, COMBINING ALL MODES OF COOPERATION (N=216)

Articulation Area	($\bar{X}$ %) Structure of Articulation Formal	 Informal
A. Exit-Admissions	38	62
B. Academic Advisement	31	69
C. Curriculum	39	61
D. Teaching Methods	31	69
E. Grading Practices	24	76
F. Crediting Practices	24	76
G. Remediation	28	72
H. Career Guidance	32	68
I. Counseling	22	78
Overall $\bar{X}$ % =	30	70

2. Comparisons by Educational Sector:

a. With the exception of SUNY 4-Year institutions, responses from secondary schools yielded a lower estimate of overall articulation than all other types of postsecondary institutions sampled. Responses from SUNY 2-Year institutions, on the other hand, yielded the highest estimate of overall articulation. Since the differences in $\overline{X}$ %'s of overall articulation by educational sector are small, they may best be interpreted by the following hypotheses for further research:

(1) Public secondary schools estimate less overall school-college articulation than do most types of postsecondary institutions.

(2) Public 2-Year postsecondary institutions estimate the highest degree of overall articulation, while Public 4-Year postsecondary institutions estimate the least.

TABLE 6

ESTIMATED OVERALL ARTICULATION BY EDUCATIONAL SECTOR

Educational Sector	$\overline{X}$ % of Cooperation (all modes combined) Much	Some-Little	None
Public Secondary	4	36	60
Postsecondary (all)	6	44	50
Private 4-Year	6	39	55
SUNY (all)	7	43	50
SUNY 2-Year	9	42	49
SUNY 4-Year	2	42	56

b. In the area of Career Guidance, SUNY 2-Year institutions estimated more articulation than any other educational sector, while private 4-Year institutions estimated the least.

TABLE 7

PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS: MEAN % OF ESTIMATED SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION BY ARTICULATION AREA, COMBINING ALL MODES OF COOPERATION AND ESTIMATED DEGREE OF PROGRAMMATIC ARTICULATION (N=122)

Articulation Area	$\bar{X}$ % of Cooperation (all modes combined) Much	Some-Little	None
A. Exit-Admissions	12	52	36
B. Academic Advisement	8	48	44
C. Curriculum	4	46	50
D. Teaching Methods	0	29	71
E. Grading Practices	1	22	77
F. Crediting Practices	1	22	77
G. Remediation	1	23	76
H. Career Guidance	4	49	47
I. Counseling	4	36	60
Overall $\bar{X}$ % =	4	36	60

TABLE 8

POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS: MEAN % OF ESTIMATED SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION BY ARTICULATION AREA, COMBINING ALL MODES OF COOPERATION AND ESTIMATED DEGREE OF PROGRAMMATIC ARTICULATION (N = 94)

Articulation Area	$\bar{X}$ % of Cooperation (all modes combined)		
	Much	Some-Little	None
A. Exit-Admissions	17	55	28
B. Academic Advisement	9	49	42
C. Curriculum	11	52	37
D. Teaching Methods	2	35	63
E. Grading Practices	1	19	80
F. Crediting Practices	2	53	45
G. Remediation	3	41	56
H. Career Guidance	6	51	43
I. Counseling	2	39	59
Overall $\bar{X}$ % =	6	44	50

TABLE 9

PRIVATE 4-YEAR: MEAN % OF ESTIMATED SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION BY ARTICULATION AREA, COMBINING ALL MODES OF COOPERATION AND ESTIMATED DEGREE OF PROGRAMMATIC ARTICULATION (N = 59)

Articulation Area	$\overline{X}$ % of Cooperation (all modes combined) Much	Some-Little	None
A. Exit-Admissions	19	48	33
B. Academic Advisement	6	52	42
C. Curriculum	12	49	39
D. Teaching Methods	4	31	65
E. Grading Practices	1	19	80
F. Crediting Practices	3	22	75
G. Remediation	4	43	53
H. Career Guidance	2	51	47
I. Counseling	0	38	62
Overall $\overline{X}$ % =	6	39	55

TABLE 10

SUNY 2-& 4-YEAR COMBINED: MEAN % OF ESTIMATED SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION BY ARTICULATION AREA, COMBINING ALL MODES OF COOPERATION AND ESTIMATED DEGREE OF PROGRAMMATIC ARTICULATION (N = 35)

Articulation Area	$\bar{X}$ % of Cooperation (all modes combined)		
	Much	Some-Little	None
A. Exit-Admissions	17	63	20
B. Academic Advisement	15	44	41
C. Curriculum	8	60	32
D. Teaching Methods	1	40	59
E. Grading Practices	0	19	81
F. Crediting Practices	2	28	70
G. Remediation	1	39	60
H. Career Guidance	12	52	36
I. Counseling	4	42	54
Overall $\bar{X}$ % =	7	43	50

TABLE 11

SUNY 2-YEAR: MEAN % OF ESTIMATED SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION BY ARTICULATION AREA, COMBINING ALL MODES OF COOPERATION AND ESTIMATED DEGREE OF PROGRAMMATIC ARTICULATION (N = 24)

Articulation Area	$\bar{X}$ % of Cooperation (all modes combined)		
	Much	Some-Little	None
A. Exit-Admissions	23	60	17
B. Academic Advisement	20	46	34
C. Curriculum	15	59	26
D. Teaching Methods	1	39	60
E. Grading Practices	0	18	82
F. Crediting Practices	3	27	70
G. Remediation	1	37	62
H. Career Guidance	15	56	29
I. Counseling	6	40	54
Overall $\bar{X}$ % =	9	42	49

TABLE 12

SUNY 4-YEAR: MEAN % OF ESTIMATED SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION BY ARTICULATION AREA, COMBINING ALL MODES OF COOPERATION AND ESTIMATED DEGREE OF PROGRAMMATIC ARTICULATION (N = 11)

Articulation Area	$\bar{X}$ % of Cooperation (all modes combined) Much	 Some-Little	 None
A. Exit-Admissions	6	68	26
B. Academic Advisement	5	39	56
C. Curriculum	0	52	48
D. Teaching Methods	0	38	62
E. Grading Practices	0	22	78
F. Crediting Practices	0	29	71
G. Remediation	0	46	54
H. Career Guidance	5	43	52
I. Counseling	0	42	58
Overall $\bar{X}$ % =	2	42	56

B. AREAS OF PRIORITY NEED FOR IMPROVED SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION

Question II: "Check the three areas in the following list which in your judgment should be given priority in the improvement of school-college articulation."

1. Total Sample: (combined secondary and postsecondary institutions)

a. The areas of articulation selected as most in need of improvement by 25% or more of the total number of respondents (all sectors combined) are as follows:

Curriculum	50%
Career Guidance	45%
Academic Advisement	37%
Exit-Admissions	34%
Teaching Methods	26%

It is interesting to note that, with the exception of Teaching Methods, the foregoing areas of articulation are the same areas that were selected (question #1) as already having the greatest degree of articulation.

b. The areas of articulation judged to be least in need of improved articulation by the total sample of respondents are as follows:

Programs for Special Groups	6%
Grading Practices	9%
Occupational Education	11%
Personal and Social Counseling	11%
Crediting Practices	12%
Adult Education	12%

It is important to note that Grading, Counseling, and Crediting were also selected (question #1) as areas already having a low degree of articulation.

2. Comparisons by Educational Sector:

a. Differences between the secondary and postsecondary (all) sectors for those areas of articulation judged to be in need of most improvement by the total sample of respondents are as follows:

	Secondary	Postsecondary	% Difference
Curriculum....................	43%	60%	17%
Career Guidance...............	51%	38%	13%
Academic Advisement...........	30%	46%	16%
Exit-Admissions...............	30%	39%	9%
Teaching Methods..............	28%	23%	5%

b. 25% or more of the respondents in the **Secondary**, Postsecondary (all), and private 4-Year sectors felt that improved articulation was needed in the area of Teaching Methods. 8% of the SUNY 2-Year respondents and 18% of the SUNY 4-Year respondents agreed.

c. 28% of the secondary respondents and 33% of the SUNY 2-Year respondents felt that improved articulation was needed in cooperative practices and programs with BOCES. Only 2% of the Private 4-Year respondents agreed, while none (0%) of the SUNY 4-Year respondents agreed.

d. 42% of the SUNY 2-Year respondents felt that improved articulation was needed in the area of Remediation. 9% of the SUNY 4-Year respondents, 14% of the Private 4-Year respondents, **and 19% of the Secondary** respondents agreed.

e. 27% of the SUNY 4-Year respondents felt that improved articulation was needed in the area of Programs for Special Groups. This contrasts sharply with the remaining educational sectors: 7% for Private 4-Year, 4% for SUNY 2-Year, and 3% for secondary schools.

f. 29% of the secondary respondents felt that improved articulation was needed in the area of Work-Study Programs. This contrasts sharply with all postsecondary sectors:

Private 4-Year................	10%
SUNY 2-Year..................	4%
SUNY 4-Year..................	0%

It is obvious that the Secondary sector feels that Work-Study is a much more important area of articulation than does the postsecondary sector.

g. If we compare the $\bar{X}$ % of priority need for improved articulation for all areas of articulation combined by educational sector, Private 4-Year institutions (X % = 39%) may be said to express a greater concern for improvement in all areas combined than any other educational sector.

TABLE 13

% ESTIMATED PRIORITY NEED FOR IMPROVED ARTICULATION BY AREA OF ARTICULATION AND BY EDUCATIONAL SECTOR

Area of Articulation	Educational Sector Secondary N=122 %	Postsecondary N=94 %	Private N=59 %	SUNY 2-Yr. N = 24 %	SUNY 4-Yr. N = 11 %	Total N = 216 %
1. Exit-Admissions	30	40	42	29	45	34
2. Academic Advisement	30	46	49	33	54	37
3. Curriculum	43	60	63	62	36	50
4. Teaching Methods	28	23	31	8	18	26
5. Grading	12	5	7	0	9	9
6. Crediting	16	5	5	4	9	12
7. Remediation	19	20	14	42	9	19
8. Career Guidance	51	38	31	50	54	45
9. Personal & Social Counseling	12	10	12	8	0	11
10. Adult Education	11	13	15	4	18	12
11. Occupational Education	16	5	3	8	0	11
12. Prog. Special Groups	3	8	7	4	27	6
13. Work-Study Programs	29	7	10	4	0	19
14. Coop. Programs with BOCES	28	10	2	33	0	20
15. Other	5	2	0	4	9	4
Overall $\overline{X}$ % =	22%	20%	39%	20%	19%	21%

C. PERCEIVED OBSTACLES TO IMPROVED AND EXPANDED SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION

Question III: "Listed below are a number of possible obstacles to articulation. Please check the appropriate boxes, indicating whether you perceive each obstacle as major, minor, or not an obstacle."

1. Total Sample: (combined secondary and postsecondary institutions)

The major obstacles to articulation as perceived by the total sample of respondents are:

	Major Obstacle	Minor Obstacle	No Obstacle
High school and college collective bargaining agencies...............	37%	32%	31%
Attitudes of college faculty......	28%	48%	24%
Attitudes of high school faculty..	28%	51%	21%

2. Comparisons by Educational Sector:

Postsecondary respondents appear to be more convinced than secondary respondents that high school and college collective bargaining agencies constitute a serious threat to improved and expanded articulation.

3. Narrative Responses (Question III 2) and Information from Telephone Interviews:

Comments from both secondary and postsecondary respondents revealed a general absence of a sense of restrictive local or State rules, regulations, or laws as obstacles to articulation. Secondary school respondents emphasize lack of staff time and money as major obstacles to articulation. Their comments generally suggest the low priority placed on school-college articulation by school administrators. Postsecondary respondents indicate a higher level of concern and more specific concerns. Obstacles to articulation cited by colleges especially centered on (a) the relationship and respective roles of BOCES and 2-year public colleges, (b) various aspects of financing (especially for community colleges).

TABLE 14

PERCEIVED OBSTACLES TO ARTICULATION BY % DEGREE OF SERIOUSNESS AND BY EDUCATIONAL SECTOR

Possible Obstacles	Degree of Seriousness					
	Secondary Sector (N=122)			PostSecondary Sector (N=94)		
	Major %	Minor %	No Obstacle %	Major %	Minor %	No Obstacle %
High School and College collective bargaining agencies..................................	28	35	37	46	30	24
Attitudes of college faculty.................	26	46	28	31	51	19
Attitudes of high school faculty.............	23	50	27	32	54	14
Attitudes of local school board members......	15	31	53	15	46	40
Attitudes of high school administrators......	14	30	56	15	56	29
Attitudes of college administrators..........	15	39	46	6	53	41
Local and State rules, regulations, and laws.	11	47	43	10	47	42
Public attitudes.............................	13	39	48	5	31	64
Attitudes of State-level educational leaders.	10	28	62	8	32	60
Attitudes of students (H.S. and college).....	7	27	66	7	33	60
Attitudes of college trustees................	7	36	57	3	24	72
Attitudes of political representatives.......	8	30	62	1	22	76
Other obstacles..............................	(N=8)	(N=1)	(N=0)	(N=10)	(N=0)	(N=0)

D. ESTIMATED IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION AS A CAMPUS CONCERN OR ISSUE

Question IV: "In your judgment, to what extent do the majority of administrators and teaching staff at your institution regard improved and expanded cooperative school-college articulation as a major educational problem or issue?"

Only a minority of Secondary and Postsecondary respondents felt that school-college articulation was a major concern or issue on their campus. Comparison of responses from the two sectors indicates that Postsecondary administrators and faculty appear to be more concerned with this issue than their secondary school counterparts. Overall, responses to this question suggest the need for increased knowledge on the part of personnel in both sectors concerning the range and significance of school-college articulation practices.

TABLE 15

ESTIMATED IMPORTANCE OF COOPERATIVE SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION AS A CAMPUS CONCERN OR ISSUE BY EDUCATIONAL SECTOR

Educational Sector	Little Importance		Moderate Importance		Major Importance	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Secondary Sector	50.0%	59	44.1%	52	5.9%	7
Postsecondary Sector	28.0%	26	55.9%	52	16.1%	15

E. THE CREDITING PRACTICES OF POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Question V: "In the list below please check (✓) if most of the departments in your institution grant credit and/or exempt courses or have plans to do so during 1975-76."

Inspection of the percentages (%) given in Table 16 indicate that the Advanced Placement Examinations of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) are the major crediting mode of school-college articulation in the State reported by this sample of postsecondary institutions. This finding is not surprising, since we already know that this is also true nationwide. The College Level Examination Program (CLEP) subject examinations and the New York State Proficiency (CPEP) and Regents External Degree Examinations are close competitors to the CEEB examinations as credit-granting devices, the former being utilized by 79% of the institutions responding to this question and the latter by 76%.

Additional Information on Crediting Practices in New York State:

1. 157 colleges grant credit for CPEP examinations. (68% of the total number of colleges - 231)
2. About 150 colleges grant credit for the Advanced Placement Examinations of the CEEB. (65%)
3. Over 80 institutions grant credit for USAFI examinations. (35%)
4. Over 100 colleges accept non-high school graduates who present GED test scores as evidence of their ability to undertake college work. (43%)
5. In the Regents External Degree Program, about 75% of the students fulfill part of their degree requirements through some form of proficiency examination.
6. Over 30 colleges grant credit for "life experience." (13%)

TABLE 16

CREDITING PRACTICES OF POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS BY CREDIT GRANTED AND BY COURSES EXEMPTED 1974-75

	Credit Granted 1974-75		Courses Exempted 1974-75	
	%	N	%	N
Advanced placement examinations (CEEB)	86.2%	81	61.7%	58
Advanced placement courses:				
a. taught by high school faculty....	46.8%	44	38.3%	36
b. taught by college faculty.......	37.2%	35	24.5%	23
College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) examinations:				
a. general examinations.............	60.6%	57	38.3%	36
b. subject examinations.............	78.7%	74	46.8%	44
American College Testing Program (ACTP) tests..............................	28.7%	27	23.4%	22
New York State College Proficiency and Regents External Degree examinations..	75.5%	71	46.8%	44
Locally prepared examinations taken at the time of matriculation.............	37.2%	35	38.3%	36
United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) examinations..................	67.0%	63	38.3%	36
Commission on Accreditation of Service Experience (CASE) courses.............	26.6%	25	17.0%	16
Non-traditional and experimental learning based on:				
a. work experience..................	34.0%	32	22.3%	21
b. licenses, certificates, etc......	30.9%	29	14.9%	14
c. other............................	8.5%	8	4.2%	4

F. ADMISSIONS PRACTICES IN POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Question VI A. "Do you utilize a common admissions application form with other colleges or utilize an admissions clearing house? If yes, please describe and evaluate its effects."

Question VI B. "Do you offer deferred admissions whereby a student is admitted who wishes to "stop-out" for some period of time before enrolling? If yes, what is the maximum deferred time usually allowed?"

It is apparent that very few private colleges and universities in the State utilize a common application form or admissions clearinghouse operation, since only one such case was reported in the sample. The twenty-eight SUNY institutions in the sample utilizing a common application form are indicative of the fact that over half (42) of the 72 units in the system now utilize such a form. Appropriate study and action should be taken to encourage the use of common application forms-clearinghouse operations among private colleges wherever feasible and appropriate. Almost none of the schools reporting use of a common form provided a narrative response in evaluating its effectiveness, so it can be assumed that the forms are at least generally satisfactory in their effectiveness.

In the area of deferred admissions, 75% of the private institutions and 61% of the SUNY units responding to this question reported the use of this practice. The maximum deferred time usually allowed was between 1 and 2 years.

TABLE 17

ADMISSIONS PRACTICES LISTED BY POSTSECONDARY SECTORS AND BY CATEGORIES OF COMMON APPLICATION FORM-ADMISSIONS CLEARINGHOUSE AND DEFERRED ADMISSIONS

Postsecondary sector	Admissions Practices							
	Common Application Form or clearinghouse				Deferred Admissions			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Private	1.8%	1	98.2%	55	75.0%	42	25.0%	14
Public (SUNY)	82.4%	28	17.6%	6	60.6%	20	39.4%	13
Total	32.2%	29	67.8%	61	69.7%	62	30.3%	27

G. NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED PRACTICES AND PROGRAMS IN SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION

Question VII: "Please describe briefly all cooperative school-college articulation practices or programs you now have or propose to implement in the near future."

Question VIII: "This question asks for a description of cooperative school-college articulation practices and programs which involve Boards of Cooperative Educational Services. (BOCES)"

1. Early Admissions: Almost all of the schools responding to the questionnaire and contacted by telephone reported some type of early admissions program. It can be safely assumed that a large number of the schools not reporting such a program do in fact have one. The programs listed below indicate both a high degree of innovation and diverseness throughout the State in this form of school-college articulation. The fact that there has been a very rapid increase in programs and enrollments in this area since 1971 gives promise of a further rapid expansion in the future.

Additional Information Concerning Early Admissions Programs in New York State:

a) The Early Admissions Guidelines issued in 1971 provide for a high school equivalency diploma after 24 credit hours of college work.

b) Slightly more than 5% of New York's high school graduates complete their diploma requirements in less than the usual 4 years.

c) The number of non-high school graduates in early admissions programs in colleges in New York State rose sharply from 367 in 1971 to 1303 in 1973. (Such enrollments still account for less than 1% of first-time full-time undergraduate enrollments in the State.)

d) 96 colleges have sent letters of compliance with State Education Department Early Admissions Guidelines.

e) The number of high school graduates in time-shortened degree programs in New York State rose from 866 in 1971 to 2637 in 1973.

f) The increase in enrollments in early admission and time-shortened degree programs between 1971 and 1973 was 214% for the State as a whole (from 1213 to 3940 within reporting institutions), 148% for the non-public sector, 54% for the City University, and 614% for the State University.

g) The number of high school equivalency diplomas has risen sharply in recent years, from 17,709 in 1969-70 to 34,236 in 1973-74.

h) 147 colleges will award sophomore standing or its local equivalent to students gaining full Advanced Placement course credits in 5 or more fields.

i) 13 colleges will award sophomore standing or its local equivalent to students gaining full Advanced Placement course credits in 3 or 4 subjects.

Some Programs of Special Interest:[63]

a) The College of White Plains. In addition to its program of regular early admissions, the college offers a special semester of college courses for high school students - "The November Semester."

---

[63] The practice and program descriptions given in this [illegible] and others are derived from three sources: (a) narrative responses from individiau institutions, (b) telephone interviews, (c) program descriptions on file in the S.E.D.

b) Marist College: A "bridge year" (3-1-3) program has been developed with two local high schools. Students attend classes taught in the high school by college or high school faculty as well as take regular courses at the college.

c) New School for Social Research: A unique 1-year program is devoted exclusively to the freshman year of college which is designed specifically for students who are ready to begin college prior to the completion of high school. Students come to the New School as college freshmen for this 1 year and upon successful completion of the program transfer as sophomores to other colleges and universities. In exceptional cases high school juniors are admitted. About 50 students are enrolled each year.

d) The New York Institute of Technology: A multifaceted "High School Opportunity Program" provides a variety of alternative formats for high school students. Besides the usual forms of early admissions, the Institute provides an external degree program whereby studies are completed through a combination of campus seminars and off-campus independent study, reinforced by faculty guidance and counseling.

e) St. John's University: As part of its early admissions program the University has an "early admissions seminar" every two weeks for students involved in the program. The seminar serves as an ongoing critique of the program and provides a mechanism for determining whether a student was in difficulty and needed immediate help. It also provides an opportunity for the students to vent their feelings and exchange ideas. Another unique feature of the program is the fact that a special director and an advisory committee oversee and develop the program. This latter group is made up of university administrators, high school administrators, college faculty, and high school counselors. The committee meets four times a year.

f) Brockport (SUC): Has an interfacing program whereby selected seniors in three public high schools take college level courses taught in the schools by high school faculty approved by the college. A unique feature of the program is the fact that the course design is jointly developed by the college and the schools. Some exchange of instructors is possible under the plan. Approximately 150 students are involved. Brockport also has a time variable undergraduate degree program which involves a number of possible options or routes whereby high school students can enter the program after 3 years of high school and complete the college program in from 3 to 5 years (presently limited to 75 students).

g) Plattsburgh (SUC), Hudson Valley Community College, and Shaker High School: A cooperative program allows the student to take certain courses in Shaker High School that will be accepted for a year of credit in the colleges. The courses are taught by high school faculty. Places are guaranteed to successful students at both colleges. A similar program is being considered with Plattsburgh High School. A unique feature of the program is that the courses were organized and approved by a joint faculty of the high school and colleges involved.

h) Auburn Community College: In cooperation with the Union Springs Central School beginning college courses are offered to approximately 25 students who come to the college via their own transportation. What is unique about this program is the fact that it involves a formal agreement with the school district.

i) Mohawk Valley Community College reports a number of options for high school seniors. They may enroll
   (a) as either full-time or part-time students
   (b) as either matriculated or non-matriculated students
   (c) in either the summer quarter following high school graduation or during any or all quarters concurrent with their senior year
   (d) for either a full-time college load with few or no concurrent high school courses or for a part-time college load with several concurrent high school courses
   (e) for credit to be applied to the college program only, the high school program only, or to both.

Approximately 100 high school seniors a year participate.

j) Morrisville (SU A&T): The college has established the Norwich Center of Morrisville College, Chenango County's College Without a Campus. The center was established to meet the educational needs of the county which had needed a community college for some time, but had been unable to afford one. The solution reached in the development of the center is an excellent example of a broadly conceived plan of school-college articulation which involved the cooperative efforts of the college, The Board of Education for the Norwich Central School District, and interested residents and business concerns. The college offers undergraduate courses afternoons and evenings in the Norwich Senior High School. Both full and part-time students are accepted. Students may register for one half the regular course fee and are eligible for scholarship aid. Credits earned in this manner may be transferred to other institutions or a student may fulfill the requirements for an associate degree at the center itself.

k) C. W. Post College: A high school and the college have developed a first-year college program for a selected group of high school seniors (Project FAST). The courses are taught in the high school by college faculty. The program results in high school graduation and a complete year of college credit. Under the program, college faculty teach a full 32-34 credits of freshman college courses in the high school. About eight Post faculty are involved, two full-time, in this program. Post faculty teaching in the high school is considered part of their regular teaching load.

l) Nassau Community College: In a joint program with the Nassau BOCES, high school students may attend the college for the summer following their junior year to study retailing and marketing. The students are guaranteed admission to the college. The program is partly remedial and partly work-study in nature. About 85 students per year are involved. In a second program with the Uniondale High School District, both high school teachers and faculty from the college teach selected courses in the high school for college credit. Between 50 and 70 students participate per year.

m) New York University: An extensive early admission program enrolls about 140 students each year. The University received a grant from the Carnegie Corporation for the counseling aspects of the program.

n) Fredonia (SUC): The college and several high schools in the same region have developed a 3-1-3 program. The critical middle year is a combination of the senior year in high school and the freshman year in college. During this year the students take half their work in high school courses that also carry college credit and the other half at the college in courses that also carry high school credit.

o) Utica College: Like a number of other colleges and universities in the State, Utica College offers summer session credit courses for students who have completed the junior year in high school. If they are successful and wish to enter the college as freshman that fall, they may do so or they may decide to return to finish the senior year in high school with some college credit that can be used in the future. The program provides both the student and the college with an opportunity to explore each other before making major commitments.

p) State University Center at Albany: A special center with an interdisciplinary focus, The James E. Allen Collegiate Center, has been established for selected students who have completed the junior year of high school. This "bridge" type program offers the opportunity for young people to have a somewhat special and protective academic and social atmosphere while also having access to the library, cultural, and intellectual resources of a university.

2. Admissions: This area of school - college articulation is rather disappointing in that very few institutions reported practices or programs that are truly innovative or comprehensive.

Some Practices and Programs of Special Interest:

a) Adelphi University: The admissions office sponsors an annual workshop for secondary school counselors. Topics vary from year to year. Approximately 50-60 counselors attend yearly.

b) Albany College of Pharmacy: Admissions personnel attempt to meet all requests from high school guidance counselors for career information and make presentations concerning the program at the College to interested groups of students in the high schools. All interested students are invited to visit the College and may attend classes if they wish and obtain the viewpoint of students already in the program. Approximately 200 interested students avail themselves of this opportunity during each academic year. In addition, the College holds an open house each year for interested students, their parents, and guidance counselors. Besides tours of the College, lectures are given by students already in the program.

c) Alfred (SU A&T): Two unique features of this program are:
   (1) A "High School Visitation Day" in which students, teachers, counselors, and administrators visit the campus.
   (2) Visitations to high schools by admissions personnel and/or faculty on a regularly scheduled basis.

d) Broome Community College: This college appears to have a well developed program of admissions practices. Some notable practices:
   (1) The College Night program is sponsored by a consortium of area schools.
   (2) Area school superintendents have met as a group on campus to discuss articulation and cooperation.
   (3) The college has sponsored numerous programs with the Binghamton Area High School Counselors Organization.
   (4) An Admissions/Financial Aid Newsletter is published regularly by the college and is sent to area high schools.

e) Cobleskill (SU A&T): On an irregular basis, the admissions staff sponsors a "day" to which advisors from high schools are invited to visit the college to discuss programs and problems and to become familiar with Cobleskill's facilities and curriculum.

f) Corning Community College: Since this community college is sponsored by the school district (Corning Painted Post School District), school-college articulation is built-in to the structure of the school. This shows up quite clearly, for example, in the admissions area in that there is continuous involvement with high school counselors. Admissions personnel visit each high school once a semester. A full range of other conventional admissions practices are also found.

g) Dominican College of Blauvelt: The college is a member of a consortium, New York Area Private Colleges. This organization, by means of mini-college days at high schools and by posters and publications, has sought to inform students as well as school personnel of the various opportunities available within the private colleges in the Metropolitan area.

h) Jefferson Community College: Each year the college designates days when high school students may visit the college and meet with administrators, faculty, and students. At this time the students may also attend classes. These opportunities are also available for students who just "drop in" at the college throughout the year. If specific high schools wish to arrange a day for their seniors to visit the campus, this is also done.

i) Mercy College: The college and its admissions officers are members of the Westchester, Putnam and Rockland Personnel & Guidance Association. This organization promotes school-college articulation.

j) Mohawk Valley Community College: The college maintains its closest contact with the area high schools through its Admissions Advisory Committee. Meeting throughout the year at 6-week intervals, this group of high school counselors and MVCC Admissions personnel and academic department heads is the source of many articulation practices.

k) St. John Fisher College: Guidance counselors from the area are invited annually to a reception and dinner at the college. At this time they have an opportunity to consult with administrators, members of the faculty and students. In addition, each year, students from area high schools are "bussed" to the campus where they have an opportunity to attend classes and meet with administrators, faculty, and students. During 1974-75, 15 of these "bus-ins" are scheduled involving approximately 400 students.

l) Schenectady Community College: The college has a "Student Recruiter Program" which involves the selection of students from each high school in the county to represent the college in their respective high schools twice per year. Following an orientation period, students are provided with material and publications, and spend one full day at the high school discussing programs, student life, and career opportunity with friends and former classmates. Each student receives an hourly salary in compensation for his/her services. Another notable admissions mechanism at the college is the Admissions Advisory Committee. This committee is composed of high school counselors and community representatives interested in the process of and access to higher education. The committee is charged with the responsibility of providing information and recommendations to the college through the Director of Admissions regarding improved articulation with the community at large and prospective student populations.

m) Ulster County Community College: "The Ulster County College Night" is a joint function of the college and the Ulster County Guidance Association.

n) Russell Sage College: This year, the admissions office is sponsoring a "Career Day" for approximately 150 high school counselors and students. Among the Day's varied activities are presentations by faculty and students from the various academic departments and a major presentation concerning career opportunities for women. The college also regularly hosts regional and professional meetings for guidance counselors.

3. Curriculum: There are a number of interesting and innovative programs in this area. Like early admissions, it would appear that there will be a rapid expansion in scale in the coming years.

Some Programs of Special Interest:

a) Adelphi University: Both the history and English departments offer on campus workshops for secondary teachers in these subjects. Students are also invited. The Speech and Hearing Department sponsors an annual career conference for high school students and teachers.

b) Binghamton (SUNY): The university has developed three audio-cassette courses that can be rented to any high school. Students may receive college credit for the courses.

c) Broome Community College: College teachers and administrators have met with their counterparts during the past year to discuss facility sharing, course and curriculum structure, and faculty exchange. Also during the past year, science and math teachers have been invited to the campus for a series of meetings.

d) College of Saint Rose: High school students may participate in college music performing groups for college credit. The advanced placement class at Albany High School sits in once a week on CSR classes and uses the library.

e) Columbia-Greene Community College: Formal agreements have been signed with the Hudson and Catskill School Districts where the college, with a few specific exceptions, has assumed responsibility for all adult education. Similar, informal agreements have been reached with the Germantown and Greenville School Districts and the BOCES Vocational Center at Philmont.

f) Fredonia (SUC): Before German was offered at a local high school, college faculty offered the course on campus for interested high school students. The same practice is currently being used for some courses in psychology. The college is currently negotiating with at least one local high school to set up a cooperative program in computer science. The college is also a member of the Southwestern School Development Association, which includes both schools and colleges in the area and which is much concerned with many aspects of school-college articulation.

g) Fulton-Montgomery Community College: The college gives advanced standing and credit to BOCES students in seven areas: electronic data processing, advanced business machines, automotive technology, construction technology, natural resources conservation, food service administration, visual communications technology.

h) Genesee Community College: Activities reported:
   - (a) Contract to provide driver education for school districts (400 students in 1974-1975)
   - (b) Contract with the Genesee-Wyoming BOCES to provide High School Equivalency Instruction.

i) Geneseo (SUC):
   - (a) Faculty in given subject areas from both the high schools and the college meet on a regular basis to work out programmatic articulation and to reduce curricular overlap.
   - (b) Correspondence courses for high school students are given college credit.
   - (c) Short-term faculty exchanges.
   - (d) In the Master Plan of the College there is a proposal for a program in which cable T.V., films, etc. would be used to prepare packaged courses for high schools in the Southern Tier that have marginal programs. Students completing the courses would receive college credit.

j) Jamestown Community College: The college has a program of cooperative education with area high schools in the areas of criminal justice, government service, electrical technology, mechanical technology. Approximately 40 students are enrolled each semester.

k) Jefferson Community College: The college is host to specific groups of high school administrators and teachers where they can meet with their counterparts to discuss mutual concerns and problems.

l) C. W. Post College of LIU
   - (a) In biology, two high school courses are given at Post because of inadequate facilities in two local high schools.
   - (b) Post is exploring with a local high school the possibility of a middle college program.
   - (c) Non-credit continuing education courses are given in about 15-25 local high schools and libraries.
   - (d) College credit is given for courses in a summer seminar in the local high schools.

m) Manhattanville College: Joint meetings of the college administration and representatives from approximately 40 high schools in the area are planned to discuss possible courses of interest to high school students which could be taught by college faculty in the high schools.

n) Monroe Community College: Planned: High school students would serve as interns in the various academic departments at the college.

o) Mt. St. Mary College:
   (a) There is some curriculum articulation through the Orange County Guidance Counselors Association.
   (b) The Division of Continuing Education of the college has a Community Advisory Board.

p) Orange County Community College:
   (a) The college provides a Saturday morning enrichment program for 150 high school students nominated by the high schools.
   (b) The college also provides a non-credit Introduction to English course and an Introduction to Science course for high school students.

q) Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Several R. P. I. faculty have been working on a volunteer basis over the past two or three years with high school science teachers in the area in the development of a unified science program for high school students. The first year of the program is now under implementation in several area schools, and a joint proposal has been submitted to NSF seeking support for a two-year summer program to train teachers to utilize the new approach.

r) St. John Fisher College: The college annually makes available its facilities and has participated in the planning for a Science Day for all of the high school teachers and students in the Central Western Zone of the New York State Science Teachers Association. As a result of this program, over 2,000 junior high and high school students attend.

s) St. Lawrence University: "Talented Junior Programs": Courses are offered for approximately 100 high school juniors - generally in fields not offered by the schools. Classes meet 10 Saturdays per semester. They are for enrichment and carry no academic credit.

t) Syracuse University: In "Project Advance" the University has developed a cooperative program with some 45 high schools from all over New York State to offer from one to five courses in the schools that will carry college credit. The courses and examinations are designed by the college faculty, but the teaching is done in the high schools by secondary school faculty who have had special preparation by the college. These courses are also open to students who do not wish college credit. This is the largest program of its kind in the State.

u) Ulster County Community College: Periodic workshops with high school faculty and the college faculty are held in various subject matter areas.

v) Adirondack Community College: This year a joint committee meeting was held between the curriculum committee of area chief secondary school administrators and the college faculty committee for articulation to discuss various ways in which greater cooperative articulation between the two systems might be achieved.

w) Buffalo (SUNY): A unique program is being developed between the university and the Buffalo public schools. The program involves dual high school - college enrollment and will permit the completion of the high school-college sequence in 6 years. In a cooperative arrangement with Bennett High School, students will take a highly individualized program of study at both schools. Participants will be drawn from throughout the city system, with 50 pupils selected in each of grades 9 through 12. A total of 200 high-achieving students are eventually expected to participate in the program. Pupil selection will be done by a screening committee of school and community representatives who will insure that the selection will be racially representative. Students enrolled in the program will take four major courses with eight college faculty assigned to the project who will teach at Bennett. The remainder of the students' courses will be regular high school courses taken with other Bennett students and taught by high school faculty. The program is designed so that the students will eventually enroll in college courses for college credit. Especially noteworthy is the fact that this entire program has been planned by a committee which includes students, parents, teachers, school and college administrators, city councilmen, and school board members.

x) Schenectady County Community College: Academic departments at the College maintain an open line of communication with high schools on curriculum articulation. For example, during this academic year, the college conducted a dinner meeting for departmental representatives and their counterparts in the high schools to discuss curriculum matters; i.e., textbooks, course content, teaching methods, etc.

4. Advisement: A large number of programs in this area are oriented toward career advisement, reflecting the increasing concern of students for information concerning the immediate and long-range employment possibilities and outlooks for various fields of academic education and technical training. The range of non-state-supported programs reported here and the degree of innovation inherent therein appear to be minimal. There are indications, however, that more institutions,

both secondary and postsecondary, are placing increased emphasis on this area (see question I), and so in the coming years we may expect to find rapid and perhaps far-reaching developments in this area. Under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965, the State Education Department, through The Bureau of Two-Year Colleges, funds a number of counseling projects in schools and community colleges.

Some Programs of Special Interest:

a) Adelphi University: Planned for 1975-76: On-campus program during the month of January designed to supplement career counseling in the secondary school. Extra-university resource people and regular faculty members will be available for consultation by students for some 100 different career fields. Expected number of students participating: 1,000 to 1,500.

b) Alfred (SU A&T): The college is exploring the possibility of establishing a series of week-long summer programs for the purpose of developing "career awareness" in each of the college's career-oriented programs - Engineering Technology, Agricultural Technology, Health Technology, and Vocational. The programs are designed primarily for high school students in the Appalachia regions.

c) Broome Community College: College Career Days have been held regularly. Teachers, administrators, students, and parents have attended.

d) Canton (SU A&T): "Operation Shadow" is a career advisement program which involves approximately 400 students from 23 high schools. High school students come to the College campus and are assigned to a college student who is in their area of career interest. The high school student spends the entire day with the college student attending classes, eating with him, etc.

e) Genesee Community College: The college has a program to assist high school counselors in improving their educational and vocational skills. (Funded from an ESEA grant to provide released personnel, software and hardware)

f) Geneseo (SUC): An area advisement center is staffed by personnel from the high schools and the college.

g) Manhattanville College:
  (a) Close coordination of the HEOP administration with high school counselors, both in identifying potential students and preparing them for the college's curriculum.

(b) Close contact is maintained with high school advisors, who help in determining problem areas of their former students.

h) Monroe Community College: Career Workshop: Orientation of high school students to a number of career areas with each career scheduled at a different time. Involves experience at both the high school and college locations.

i) St. John Fisher College: Campus career program for high school students.

j) Upstate Medical Center (SUNY):
   (a) "Guided Occupational Training" or "Vocational Orientation Program": All area high schools and junior high schools have an opportunity to select six students to participate in the program. The students spend a week at the center, during which time they observe health professionals working. They are tested and are counseled in the training available here and elsewhere. Each week a different school participates. Approximately 100-150 students participate in this program during the year.
   (b) In a program established with the Health Occupations Department of Central Technical High School, students receive training and experience in one of three areas:
      (1) Health Occupations
      (2) Dental Assisting
      (3) Nursing training at the nurses aid level.

k) Schenectady County Community College: The Department of Business and Criminal Justice has annually conducted a High School Business Day and a Criminal Justice Career Day. The Criminal Justice Career Day is designed to provide opportu [illegible] for prospective high school students to attend a program sponsored [illegible] the college bringing them into contact with professionals in the Law Enforcement field at the local, state, and federal levels.

l) Russell Sage College: See description under Admissions (n.).

Programs Funded Under ESEA Title III 1973-74:

a) New York City Community College: "Career Counseling Via Video-tape."

Developed and produced four videotape presentations portraying the various career/educational options available at the college; i.e., Commerce, Health, and Technologies.

b) SUNY-ATC Canton: "Operation Shadow."

Intent of the project was to alleviate many of the inaccurate perceptions that students have regarding 2-year technical programs.
Phase I - College staff member visits high schools within the county to present program describing options available at the college.
Phase II - Interested students were invited to the college for an entire day to "shadow" a student on campus; i.e., attend classes, eat in the dorm, etc. (Also see listing under (d.).)

c) Genesee Community College: "Inservice Training for High School Guidance Counselors to Conduct Vocational Counseling Workshops."

Purpose was to train high school counselors in vocational counseling for 11th graders and inform high school faculty of career options in their academic areas.

d) SUNY-Albany, Two-Year College Student Development Center: "Leadership Coordination for Student Affairs and Instruction in the Two-Year Colleges."

Object was to effect improvement in community college counseling and advising services for students through coordination between college leaders responsible for the areas of instruction and student affairs. Focus was on those activities affecting student success (progress toward a degree or employment) and development.

e) Mohawk Valley Community College: "Transfer Counseling Through Video-taping."

Request for funds to experiment with improving 4-year college transfer counseling via video tape.

5. Teaching Methods: Very little is being done in the area of school-college articulation concerning teaching methods, and the low interest expressed in improving articulation in this area, both in the questionnaire (see question I) and in the telephone interviews, must lead one to conclude that little will be done in the immediate future to improve the situation.

Programs of Special Interest:

a) Delhi (SU A&T): Planned:

   (a) Shared teaching resource center.

   (b) Workshop program with the high schools to improve teaching effectiveness.

b) Geneseo (SUC):
   (a) Special laboratory school utilized by both the high schools and the college to improve teaching
   (b) Summer workshop program with participants from both the high schools and the college to improve teaching effectiveness
   (c) Short-term faculty exchanges.

c) Old Westbury (SUC):
   (a) Shared use of special facilities as a means of increasing teaching effectiveness
   (b) Shared or cooperative use of new developments in instructional technology (computer-based instruction, etc.).

d) St. Lawrence University: High school counselor visits to campus through the Associated Colleges of the St. Lawrence Valley are carried out annually, approximately 40 guidance counselors each year

e) New School for Social Research: In its unique bridge program for qualified high school students, New School employs not only its regular faculty to teach the courses involved, but also successful practicing persons in the academic area concerned. There is no permanent faculty for this program. (See Early Admissions (C).)

f) Russell Sage College: One faculty member teaches a course in a local high school for high school credit. The course is used as a laboratory course for the College's education majors.

6. Remediation: Most State-supported programs involving remediation are reported in the next section, Programs for Special Groups. Beyond these programs, the comments made concerning teaching methods also apply to this area of articulation; i.e., not much is being done, the level of concern is low, and immediate future improvements are doubtful.

Programs of Special Interest:

a) Adelphi University: University students tutor elementary and secondary school students.

b) Alfred (SU A&T):
   (a) A special five-semester extended program where the first semester includes remedial plus one or two credit courses. The program is applicable to veterans, older persons, as well as recent high school graduates.
   (b) A summer 3-week Reading-Study Skills Program for area high school students.

c) Manhattanville College: Some informal tutoring of high school students by college students.

d) Mohawk Valley Community College: MVCC students provide remedial and tutoring services in one of the city's grade schools. The sessions are held one evening per week and involve 50-60 students and up to 25 college students. The program has gained acceptance by the grade school teaching personnel who now participate in planning sessions and help with tutorial services.

e) New York Institute of Technology: "Pre-Freshman Special Education Program" - This program is designed to strengthen a student's capabilities in basic college studies. Open to high school seniors and juniors on a part-time basis during the school year, or in a concentrated 8-week summer session.

f) Old Westbury (SUC):
   (a) College students tutoring high school students who need help.
   (b) Minority college students tutor minority high school students who need help.

g) College of Saint Rose: The college accepts qualified high school students who have dropped out of high school and who wish to earn a GED by successful completion of the freshman college year.

h) Fordham University: College students tutor elementary, secondary, and minority group students who need help through both on-campus and off-campus programs.

i) Russell Sage College:
   (a) College students tutoring high school students. Approximately 30 college students involved per year.
   (b) Planned: A "Reading Diagnosis Center" for elementary and high school students with reading difficulties. The Center will serve as a laboratory school for the college's students in special education.

7. Programs for Special Groups: New York State ranks highest among all the states in terms of program support for its educational programs for the educationally and economically disadvantaged. This is reflected in the fact that in 1973, 16.5% of the full-time freshmen in New York State colleges were minority group members, while only 14.1% of the general population in the college age group of the State were minority group members. The number of disadvantaged in special programs (SEEK, BOP, HEOP) rose from 1,215 students in 1966 to an estimated 31,400 in 1974-75. Ten State-supported Educational Opportunity Centers are specifically designed to provide academic remediation, tutoring, and counseling to prepare students for post-secondary education. These centers, which are administered by State University campuses, with cooperation from public and private colleges, are a vital avenue of school-college articulation for the disadvantaged. New York State's commitment to such programs is reflected in the many individual programs affiliated with SEEK, BOP, HEOP found on college and university campuses throughout the State. The State also funds a large number of college programs to meet the specialized educational needs of the disadvantaged under the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Title I). Some of these programs directly and indirectly bear on the problem of school-college articulation.

Some Programs of Special Interest:

a) Barnard College: The College cooperates with New York University and local metropolitan high schools in housing and sharing expenses of the PREP program which provides for selected minority students doing work beyond high school in mathematics, sciences, and other studies for pre-medical preparation. There were 124 participants in the summer program of 1974.

b) College of Saint Rose: In conjunction with the Albany Urban League, the College has initiated a program to prepare black students for medical school. Students are involved with CSR during their junior year in high school and would come to CSR as early matriculated students in their senior year. (No students yet.)

c) College of White Plains: A program for bilingual students with an "early semester" or remediation provision is planned.

d) Corning Community College: In a program for disadvantaged adults, high school graduates are accepted into a special 1-year program. Students take courses which give them credit and which are intended to bridge the gap between high school and the regular college curriculum. If the student successfully completes the first year, he transfers into the regular program.

e) Fashion Institute of Technology: There are many programs under the auspices of the Division of Continuing Education which allow high school drop-outs to gain exposure to the fields of study at FIT, but in a semi-informal manner. Programs are directed to populations such as the following:
1) Disadvantaged students of Spanish-speaking backgrounds
2) Disadvantaged minority students.

f) Fulton-Montgomery Community College: Qualified non-high school graduates (in addition to early admissions students) are admitted as freshmen. Approximately 20 students per year.

g) Genesee Community College:
a) Contract with the Genesee-Wyoming BOCES to provide High School Equivalency instruction. Approximately 60 students in 1974-75.
b) Cooperation with the High School Equivalency Program at the Attica Correctional Facility. Approximately 50 students in 1974-75.

h) Hudson Valley Community College: The continuing education program includes both high school graduates and non-high school graduates.

i) L.I.U. - C. W. Post: There are a number of programs for adult and working clienteles including the Weekend College, special programs with industries (24 Friday sessions at one plant), a program with the N.Y.C. Police Department, a program with the N. Y. Port Authority, and a program with the Office of Local Government.

j) Mohawk Valley Community College: The College Division for Continuing Education has long had a practice of offering college course work in the classrooms of outlying high schools and in other community facilities where a need is demonstrated.

k) Morrisville (SU A&T): Norwich Center - see description under Early Admissions heading.

l) Mt. St. Mary College: There is a new Friday/Saturday College. It is possible to earn bachelor's degree in 4 years.

m) Orange County Community College: The College provides an extensive Community Services Program (Vocational, Recreational, Enrichment, etc.). Over 350 late afternoon and evening courses are offered using the facilities of six high schools and BOCES. The high school faculty is used with the college providing in-service training, if needed. Some high school students take these courses, but the exact number is unknown. Approximately one-third of the courses carry credit. In addition, the college provides a Saturday morning enrichment program for 150 high school students nominated by the high school.

n) Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: "Academic Opportunity Consortium" to motivate and encourage Black students to enter RPI. The program is affiliated with HEOP and provides remedial work, tutoring, financial aid benefits, etc.

o) St. John Fisher College: The college has a program with an inner-city high school in the city of Rochester which permits several of the seniors to take courses at the college for no charge.

p) St. Lawrence University:
   a) "Operation Kanyengehaga": Approximately 20 students tutor Mohawk school children on their reservation weekly during the college year
   b) "Upward Bound Program": Approximately 60 students.
   c) "Pre-Upward Bound Program": Approximately 260 Mohawk school children visit the campus daily for a 6-week period during the summer.

q) Schenectady County Community College: As the sponsor of the State University of New York Educational Opportunity Center (EOP), the College provides an avenue of articulation with regard to career counseling, testing, and postsecondary remedial studies in preparation for either continued study or degree or immediate employment following a short preparation in a skill-oriented course.

r) Russell Sage College: A work-study program is planned in which high school students will work in college student employment positions.

8. School-College Articulation Involving BOCES: As would be expected, the largest number of articulation programs involving BOCES are conducted by community colleges. Narrative responses from the questionnaire and telephone interviews indicate that such arrangements are both widespread and diverse. Under the Vocational Education Act the State Education Department, via The Bureau of Two-Year Colleges, funds a number of cooperative projects between BOCES and community colleges in occupational curricula.

Some Programs of Special Interest:

a) Alfred (SU A&T): Planned: A summer automotive program for 2-year BOCES graduates which would function to prepare them to enter the college's regular automotive curriculum as seniors and to complete the program in 1 year as opposed to the customary 2 years.

b) Broome Community College: A representative of the college sits on the BOCES Advisory Committee.

c) Cobleskill (SU A&T): Planned: The college has started to investigate the possibility of closer articulation with BOCES units in certain fields. For example, the Food Service Administration division is currently examining, with BOCES faculty, BOCES' course outlines with the view of giving such students advanced standing and/or credit in the foods area if they enroll at Cobleskill.

d) Columbia-Greene Community College: (see Curriculum (E)) Planned: The College and the BOCES Vocational Center at Philmont are currently developing plans that would involve the shared use of facilities and possibly of faculty.

e) Community College of the Finger Lakes: The College offers courses at BOCES centers taught by college faculty, and the students completing these courses receive credit in both their high school and the college. Students may earn up to 18 college credits during their senior year in high school.

f) Dutchess Community College: The college and local BOCES center have an articulation steering committee which meets twice a year to develop articulation practices and procedures. In the planning stage is a proposal to establish a common subject matter advisory committee that would serve both institutions. Another possibility being considered is the sharing of staff and faculty.

g) Fulton-Montgomery Community College: There are major arrangements, including joint planning, between the college and the local BOCES. Physical facilities are shared and five technology courses of the college are taught at the BOCES center by college instructors. See Curriculum (G).

h) Genesee Community College: There is an articulation agreement between the college and the Genesee-Wyoming BOCES concerning drafting courses taken at the BOCES center which will allow students successfully completing these to receive credit at GCC and be admitted to advanced level drafting courses at the college. Approximately 60 students. See Curriculum (H).

i) Mercy College: "Mercy College/BOCES Career College" - extension of advanced study program. Students in selected Westchester high schools are able to take credit-bearing college courses along with their regular senior schedule.

j) Nassau Community College: In a joint program with the Nassau BOCES, high school students attend the college for the summer following their junior year to study retailing and marketing. The students are guaranteed admission to the college. The program is partly remedial and partly work-study in nature. About 85 students per year are involved.

k) New York Institute of Technology: Planned: A program is being designed with the local BOCES center to coordinate high school and college programs for students whose career interests have crystallized early. Includes all areas in which NYIT is offering post high school courses.

l) Orange County Community College: There is joint planning of occupational programs with BOCES and the high school through an AD HOC committee. The college offers a joint certificate with BOCES. BOCES equipment is shared with the college.

m) Ulster County Community College: The Dean of Faculty at the college is a member of the BOCES Advisory Council.

n) Auburn Community College: The college has five programs leading to certificates in which the student takes academic courses at Auburn and then in the late afternoon makes use of BOCES' facilities for courses in specific trades.

o) Rockland Community College: The college has planned and implemented a joint program with the local BOCES center that facilitates the further training of students who complete BOCES programs in areas such as Licensed Practical Nursing. The cooperative project also seeks to provide additional educational opportunities for adults.

p) Delhi (SU A&T): Joint program development with BOCES and area schools, especially in regard to Career Education, early admissions, and remediation.

Programs Funded Under the Vocational Education Act (VEA): (1973-74)

a. Corning Community College: Steuben County BOCES - Automotive Technology (A.O.S. Degree)

b. Morrisville (SU A&T): Oswego BOCES - Nursing (Planned for fiscal year 1975 funding)

c. Dutchess Community College: Dutchess County BOCES and local school district - Career Counseling

d. Adirondack Community College: Warren-Washington-Hamilton Counties BOCES - Industrial Laboratory Testing and Radio Broadcasting Certificate Programs

e. Fulton-Montgomery Community College: Fulton-Montgomery BOCES - Implementation of certificate programs in Natural Resources Conservation Technology; Automotive Technology; Food Service Technology; Construction Technology (Also see listing under (g.) and Curriculum (g.).)

f. Auburn Community College: Cayuga County BOCES - Development of Cooperative Certificate Programs utilizing shared facilities and equipment

g. Genesee Community College: See previous listing (h.).

h. CUNY Two-Year Colleges: New York City Board of Education - Planned: An agreement is being worked out between the NYC Board of Education, through its Office of Career Education, and five CUNY two-year colleges. The project's purpose is to articulate secondary-postsecondary cooperative education programs in aspects such as Job Development, Job Data Bank, and Joint Public Relations to promote cooperative education. A coding system is planned to facilitate access of secondary cooperative education students into comparable postsecondary coop programs. Community colleges that will participate: Bronx, Borough of Manhattan, Kingsborough, LaGuardia, and New York City.

9. Sharing of Facilities and/or Services: Most of the programs reported in this area, beyond those involving BOCES, appear to be rather minor in scope and significance.

Some Programs of Special Interest:

a) Adirondack Community College: The certificate program uses several of the shops in the BOCES facility for the lab portion of this College program (an apprentice program which allows an individual to earn college credits for a Machinist Program sponsored by a local industry).

b) Broome Community College: The College occasionally utilizes the computer facilities at BOCES.

c) Cobleskill (SU A&T): The College supplies classroom and infirmary space for a BOCES LPN program.

d) College of Saint Rose: The Albany Adult Learning Center uses College space for its program to prepare adults for high school equivalency.

e) Corning Community College: Corning has an extensive evening and after-school-hours program for adults which is housed in the buildings of the Elmira Free Academy, Chemung BOCES, and three high schools. The College also uses the lab of the Steuben BOCES auto mechanics program.

f) Dowling College: There is reciprocal use of rooms and gyms with La Salle Military Academy and other high schools.

g) Fredonia (SUC): There is much cooperation in the area of sharing audio-visual equipment with local high schools and BOCES.

h) Geneseo (SUC):
   (a) Classroom space is shared with local high schools.
   (b) The Campus School is heavily used for special education involving BOCES students who are bussed in.
   (c) The Speech Pathology Clinic on campus serves schools of all types in the area.

i) Herkimer County Community College Use of BOCES labs for College Automobile Technology curriculum.

j) Jamestown Community College: Use of facilities of 4 high schools for "extension centers."

David Petty, Asst. Dean of Instruction

k) L.I.U. - C. W. Post: Non-credit continuing education courses are given in about 15-25 local high schools and libraries.

l) Orange County Community College: See Cooperation With BOCES.

m) St. Lawrence University: The University is a member of the North Country School Boards Institute and provides facilities and sponsors activities for school boards.

n) Ulster County Community College: The College's evening program uses secondary schools as extension centers.

o) Brockport (SUC): The College library is available to high school students.

10. Cooperative Sharing of Personnel: Most of the programs reported under this heading have already been cataloged under early admissions in programs involving college faculty teaching in the high schools. Beyond this, there appears to be a paucity of programs in this area.

Some Programs of Special Interest:

a) Brockport (SUC): See Early Admissions (f)

b) Dutchess Community College: See BOCES (f)

c) Elmira College: Reports "limited sharing."

d) Geneseo (SUC):
   (a) Area or regional advisement center staffed by personnel from both the high schools and the college.
   (b) Short-term faculty exchanges.

e) Jefferson Community College: The College employs high school faculty to teach on a part-time basis at the college. This year there are eight such individuals teaching evenings at the college.

f) Plattsburgh (SUC): Some SUC faculty teach courses for the handicapped at BOCES.

11. Other Practices and Programs of School-College Articulation:

a) Ruppert Education Center: This is a publicly financed secondary school education center in New York City which enrolls volunteer students in an educational program that uses cultural institutions, businesses, and urban agencies as well as academic institutions. It is operated by the New York City Board of Education.

b) Three-year undergraduate degree programs are now available at Brockport (SUC), Buffalo (SUNY), Binghamton (SUNY), Fredonia (SUC), Plattsburgh (SUC), Albany (SUNY), Colgate University, College of New Rochelle, Manhattanville College, New York University: Wash. Square College, Pace University, St. John Fisher College, Utica College, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Marist College, Geneseo (SUC).

c) La Guardia Community College: The college has developed a plan for a "middle college" that will include the last 3 years of high school with the first 2 years of college. It is possible that some students might use this opportunity to reduce the time needed to obtain the associate degree, but another major objective is to provide early special attention for some students who can thus avoid the need for remediation in the 13th and 14th grades.

d) John Jay College of Criminal Justice: The college is developing plans for a grade 10 through 12 school in the criminal justice field.

e) Dutchess Community College: An Articulation Center for Occupational Education, covering a seven-county area, has been established. It has already made a survey of the need for and resources for such education and seeks to promote postsecondary occupational training programs closely and carefully articulated with high schools and BOCES occupational courses and programs.

f) Regional Learning Service of Central N. Y.: A regional learning service in an 11-county area has been established to encourage the development of cooperative programs between schools and colleges. An External High School Diploma will be offered and the necessary resources and counseling for its achievement provided.

g) Mohawk Valley Community College: An example of three-way articulation was developed by the college during this past year. The college and the Utica Symphony jointly hired one individual to teach music for the college and to conduct the symphony for the city. This year the cooperation was expanded to include a junior symphony composed of local high school students and other interested non-professionals from the community. The college provides the teaching personnel and rehearsal area for this very successful venture.

h) Ulster County Community College: An example of formal cooperative school-college articulation in the area of administration is provided in this instance in which the college president meets regularly with the school superintendents in the county as part of their structure. In addition, since 1968 secondary school counselors have sat on all college's advisory councils.

i) Corning Community College: A committee was established 7 years ago with the Steuben BOCES, the Corning High School, and the college, each contributing several members, which meets once a month and is the source of all special projects.

j) Mt. St. Mary College: The Division of Continuing Education of the college has a Community Advisory Board.

H. THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK: COOPERATIVE SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION PROGRAM WITH THE NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

An extensive program of cooperative school-college articulation, involving many areas of articulation, is currently under development by The City University of New York (CUNY) and the New York City Board of Education. The major objective of the program is to shift the university's remedial burden to the city's public school system. The program is designed to insure that greater numbers of New York City students who go on to college are equipped for college-level work. Other objectives of the program are to articulate school/college career programs and to provide better guidance and counseling.

Thousands of students at 24 high schools and junior high schools are now involved in a large variety of cooperative programs with CUNY. CUNY faculty and students from senior schools of education are working closely with high school faculty in the project. Seminars in counseling and career preparation for high school and college counselors are also being scheduled, assisted by a $250,000 grant to the Board of Education.

The significance of this major program of articulation goes far beyond the many innovative individual programs presently developed. The Board of Higher Education and the Board of Education have decided to develop fundamentally closer ties that promise to produce major advances in the relationship between the two systems of education. Among the many additional areas of articulation currently under discussion by the two Boards are the following:

(1) Faculty exchanges betweem the two systems for limited periods.
(2) Summer remedial and advanced placement programs on college

campuses for high school students

(3) Expanded use of the city schools as "teaching laboratories" by CUNY's schools of education

(4) Expanded early admissions program

(5) Greater integration of parallel programs of study in the high schools and community colleges

(6) "Adoption" of some high schools by the colleges.

Descriptions of individual programs now in operation or in the planning stage are found in the following news release from CUNY's Office of University Relations:

BOARD OF EDUCATION/BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

Hunter College - Seward Park High School (Career Education)

A "Communications Workshop School" with 90 tenth grade students -- three classes — began this September; about 200 eleventh and twelfth grade students are taking electives within the school. In the morning students take courses parallel to regular courses, but with a focus on an area of communication: journalism, television, art. In the afternoon they work on projects designed to be of value to the high school and the surrounding community. A community museum located in the high school annex will house displays (graphics, videotape, multi-media) produced by the students as part of their course work.

Hunter College faculty and students interact in all phases of the program — designing materials, tutoring students, providing skills remediation. The Hunter students take all their education courses at the high school, providing them with immediate learning experiences.

Brooklyn College - Thomas Jefferson High School (Remedial Education)

Remedial reading, writing and math classes currently enroll over 100 Jefferson students in 11 classes. The program is expected to double in size in the spring. Brooklyn College faculty from the School of Education work with their Jefferson counterparts in developing and presenting materials.

The main purpose of the program is to lessen the need for remedial work when students enter the CUNY system. By providing an opportunity for field experience, the program also articulates with the first phase of education courses taken by students at the college.

Queens College - Andrew Jackson High School (Remedial)

The program consists of a planned series of workshops for students and teachers, tutorial assistance, creation and adoption of curricular materials, assessment of the learning environment and the extent of parent and community involvement.

York College - Springfield Gardens High School (Remedial)

This program in English and math is for 11th and 12th grade students.

Staten Island Community College - Port Richmond and Curtis High Schools (Remedial)

A program of remediation in basic writing, reading and mathematics skills for juniors and seniors is supplemented by jointly staffed Centers at each school emphasizing enrichment and remediation.

Hunter College - Julia Richman High School (Remediation)

The "Venture" program in English, mathematics and science skills development.

Brooklyn College - John Jay High School (Remedial)

The program begins this month with a 12-day experimental mini-course in writing for 12th grade students taught by faculty from the high school and the college. The total remediation program will begin this spring.

Brooklyn College - Wingate High School (Remedial)

College and high school faculty have prepared a set of recommendations for remedial programs in English, mathematics and bi-lingual instruction to begin this spring.

Staten Island Community College/Richmond College - High School Redirection

This demonstration program represents the joint efforts of three organizations in assisting highly motivated college-bound high school students who dropped out of other high schools to graduate, and at the same time obtain up to six college credits for courses taken at the high school and the colleges.

Borough of Manhattan Community College - Central Commercial/Brandeis High Schools

In this career program in data processing, classes in COBOL for 80 high school seniors are now under way. A series of remedial sessions will begin during the spring semester. Students will also visit college and industry data processing installations.

Bronx Community College - George Washington/Theodore Roosevelt High Schools (Career)

A new program in marketing, jointly designed by high school and college faculty, will be offered to 40 high school seniors for college credit this spring. These students are currently visiting the college and marketing sites.

New York City Community College - Erasmus Hall High School (Career)

This two-semester course in accounting is for seniors who will be admitted to the second semester of the fundamental accounting course at New York City Community College.

Kingsborough Community College - Lincoln/New Utrecht High Schools (Career)

This program in supermarket management operates with the cooperation of food merchants and labor unions, who provide work training stations at various establishments as an integral part of the high school/college program.

La Guardia Community College "Middle College" - in cooperation with seven junior high schools from Districts 24 and 30

Designed to provide the high school student with personalized instruction, intensive help in basic skills and a comprehensive introduction to career education. The program begins in the 10th grade and continues through the sophomore year of college.

Brooklyn College - Midwood High School (Remedial)

College faculty, on a volunteer basis, are assisting the high school in planning a science readiness program for educationally disadvantaged students.

Brooklyn College - Erasmus Hall High School

Faculty from the college's school of performing arts are advising the high school on curriculum development, staff recruitment and facilities planning for the performing arts.

The following schools and colleges are planning cooperative arrangements:

New York City Community College - Westinghouse/Grady High Schools, a five year articulated program in engineering technology.

Medgar Evers College - Boys/Prospect/Wingate High Schools, articulation of courses in all disciplines.

City College - Benjamin Franklin High School, programs in remedial math and English.

Lehman College - Lehman High School, programs in remedial math and English.

I. THE TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

Besides the valuable information gathered concerning specific practices and programs in various areas of articulation at the thirty institutions contacted by phone, interviews with administrators resulted in the following generalizations:

1. The most extensive school-college articulation appears to take place between community colleges and high schools rather than between other types of post-secondary institutions and high schools. Interviews with community college respondents indicated the following:
   a. Community college administrators and faculty are much more conscious of the nature and breadth of school-college articulation than their counterparts in other types of post-secondary institutions.
   b. Most community colleges have a long history of close cooperation with local high schools and BOCES units. Indeed, some of their faculty have been drawn from the same high schools. Thus, the idea of college faculty teaching in high school or high school faculty teaching in college does not seem foreign or abhorrent as it does to many faculty in four year institutions.
   c. Both fewer problems and less faculty resistance concerning school-college articulation were reported by community college respondents.
2. It is very clear that in order to fully understand what is going on at a particular campus in school-college articulation, one must talk to many people. It is rare to find one person who is knowledgeable about everything that is going on. This is particularly true of large institutions

and less true of small community colleges. Most respondents were able to talk at some length about one or two large institution-wide programs they were intimately familiar with, but grew vague when questioned about other practices and programs. This suggests the need for someone or some body on each campus to centralize and coordinate articulation activities, such as an articulation "officer" or "office."

3. School-college articulation was done informally at every institution contacted save one, where articulation was mandated because the community college was part of the local school district (Corning Community College). Articulation at most campuses appears largely a matter of each department or academic division going its own way, with little knowledge of what is going on elsewhere in the college.

4. The school-college articulation practices reported were almost all controlled by the post-secondary institution involved, with the high schools occupying a subservient role. No cases were reported of the high schools or BOCES units initiating or controlling articulation arrangements. It might be added that community college respondents indicated a greater willingness than did respondents from four year institutions to cooperate on a more equalitarian basis with high schools and BOCES units.

5. Faculty Resistance to Articulation:

   a. Most faculty resistance, both organized and unorganized, was reported at the high schools. The reason most frequently cited was the fact that many high school administrators and faculty objected to the loss of their brightest students through early admissions programs. In addition, they also feared the loss of both state aid and faculty positions as a result of such practices.

b. Most respondents reported little faculty resistance at post-secondary institutions, mainly because there was either little in the way of articulation practices or that the program in effect had not threatened the loss of faculty positions. The extensive three-year B.A. program at SUC Geneseo is noteworthy in this regard, because no significant faculty resistance was experienced from the very beginning. The reason given for this is the fact that faculty were significantly involved in the planning and implementation of the program at all stages of its development.

c. Most respondents warned that widespread and serious organized resistance would come from both high school and college faculty if large scale articulation programs were forced upon them that appeared likely to threaten faculty jobs.

6. Early Admissions - A large number of schools reported early admissions programs. Most of these were aimed at bright students and the numbers involved were generally small.

7. Crediting Practices - Credit for life experience is not now generally given, but is being considered at a number of institutions. Credit for advanced placement tests and courses is quite widespread.

8. Role of the State and State Education Department - Most respondents were not in favor of direct State control in school-college articulation. The majority were in favor of voluntary arrangements worked out locally on

an informal basis. The input of the State and State Education Department was seen as being one primarily of establishing guidelines, giving information on other programs in the State, and helping in an advisory role.

9. Obstacles to Articulation - Quite surprisingly, none of the respondents reported any serious obstacles from local or State rules or laws. Most have apparently been able to work out articulation arrangements successfully within the existing set of rules, regulations, and laws found in the State.

J. A CHECKLIST OF SELECTED SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION PRACTICES IN SELECTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NEW YORK STATE

Table 18 summarizes much of the information gathered via the questionnaire and telephone interviews.

TABLE 18

SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION PRACTICES IN NEW YORK STATE IN SELECTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (SEE KEY ON PAGE 117)

Institution	Early Admissions	Admissions	Curriculum	Advisement	Teaching Methods	Remediation	Prog. for Spec. Groups	BOCES	Sharing of fac./ser.	Sharing personnel
Adelphi Univ.	B	X	CE	F		X				
Adirondack C.C.	AB								X	
Albany Coll.of Pharm.		X								
Alfred (SU A&T)	AB	X		(F)		X		(X)		
Barnard Coll.	AB						X			
Binghamton (SUNY)	A		X							
Brockport (SUC)	AB		C						X	X
Broome C.C.		X	DE	X				X	X	
Buffalo (SUC)	AB									
Canton(SU A&T)				X						
Cobleskill (SU A&T)	AB	X						(X)	X	
Coll.Mt. St.Vincent	A		C							
Coll.of Saint Rose	AB		X			X	X		X	
Coll.of White Plains	A(B)						(X)			
Columbia-Greene C.C.	AB		D					X(X)		
C.C. of Finger Lakes			D					X		
Corning C.C.	A	X	C				X		X	
Delhi (SU A&T)	A		C		(X)			X		
Dom. Coll. Blauvelt	AB	X								
Dowling Coll.	AB		D						X	
Dutchess C.C.	A		X					X(X)		(X)
Elmira Coll.	A								X	X
Fashion Inst.Tech.							X			
Fordham Univ.	AB		(C)			X				
Fredonia (SUC)	AB		(D)X						X	
Fulton-Montgomery C.C.	AB		DX				X	X	X	
Genesee C.C.			DX	X			X	X		
Geneseo (SUC)	AB		CDE(X)	X	X				X	X
Hartwick Coll.	A									
Herkimer County C.C.	U								X	
Hofstra Univ.	AB									
Hudson Valley C.C.	AB		C				X			
Jamestown C.C.	B		C				X		X	
Jefferson C.C.	AB	X	X							X
Keuka Coll.			X							
Kirkland Coll.	AB		X				X		X	
L.I.U.-C.W.Post	AB		XD(X) (C)				X			
Manhattan Coll.										

TABLE 18 (CONT'D)

SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION PRACTICES IN NEW YORK STATE IN SELECTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (CONT'D)

Institution	Early Admissions	Admissions	Curriculum	Advisement	Teaching Methods	Remediation	Prog. for Spec. Groups	BOCES	Sharing of fac./ser.	Sharing Personnel
Manhattanville Coll.	AB		(D)	X		X				
Maria Regina Coll.	A									
Marist Coll.	A		D							
Marymount Manhatt. Coll	U		D							
Medaille Coll.	U									
Mercy Coll.	AB	X				X		X		
Mohawk Valley C.C.	AB	X	X			X	X		X	
Monroe C.C.	AB	X	D	X						
Morrisville (SU A&T)	B		D				X			
Mt. St. Mary Coll.	AB		X				X			
Nassau C.C.	A		CD					X		
Nazareth Coll.	(A)		(C)							
New Sch. for Soc.Res.	AB				X					
N.Y. Inst. Tech.	AB					X	X	(X)		
New York Univ.	AB									
North Country C.C.			C							
Old Westbury (SUC)					X	X			X	
Oneonta (SUC)	U						X			
Orange County C.C.	U						X	X	X	
Pace Univ.	B		D							
Plattsburgh (SUC)	AB		X					X	X	X
Rens. Polytech.Inst.	AB		X			X	X			
Roberts Wesleyan Coll.	A									
Rockland C.C.	AB							X		
Rosary Hill Coll.	AB		C							
Russell Sage Coll.	AB	X		X		X				X
St. Francis Coll.	B									
St. John Fisher Coll.	AB	X	CX	X			X			
St. John's Univ.	B									
St. Lawrence Univ.	A	X	X		X		X		X	
St.Thomas Aquinas Coll.	AB		DX							
Schenectady County C.C.	AB	X	X	X			X			
Siena Coll.	B									
Skidmore Coll.	A									
Sullivan County C.C.	AB		X							
Syracuse Univ.	AB		CX							
Ulster County C.C.	AB	X	X					X	X	
Upstate Medical Ctr.(S)				X						
Utica Coll.	A		D					X		
Auburn C.C.	A									

TABLE 18 KEY

A - Non-matriculated, in which the student retains his high school status. This type has two variations:

(1) The high school student enrolls in college summer session courses between his junior and senior years, and

(2) The high school student enrolls in college courses during the academic year concurrently with his senior year high school work.

B - Matriculated, in which the student studies full time under supervision at the college level before completing formal course work for the diploma at the high school.

Note: A "bridge" program (3-1-3) combining the senior year of high school with the freshman year of college is categorized here as B.

U - too little information to classify as either A or B.

C - College courses taught in high school or BOCES by high school faculty.

D - College courses taught in high school or BOCES by college faculty.

E - Faculty workshops/conferences (curriculum).

F - Career guidance.

( ) - One of the above letters in parentheses indicates a planned program to be implemented in the near future.

X - Indicates a significant practice or program.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A. KEY FINDINGS

1. School-college articulation is not viewed as a major campus concern or issue by most secondary and postsecondary respondents. Postsecondary respondents reported a significantly higher level of concern for this issue than secondary respondents.

2. The degree of overall school-college articulation estimated by the total sample of respondents, combining all modes of coopration and all areas of articulation, was minimal, with only 5% of the responses falling into the "much" articulation category.

3. Public secondary schools estimate less overall school-college artiaulation (all modes of cooperation combined and all areas of articulation combined) than do all types of postsecondary institutions, with the exception of Public 4-Year institutions, which estimate even less than the secondary schools. Public 2-Year institutions estimate the highest degree of overall school-college articulation.

4. Exit-Admissions, Curriculum, Academic Advisement and Career Guidance are the areas of school-college articulation estimated to have the greatest present degree of articulation by the total sample of respondents (secondary and postsecondary combined).

5. Grading Practices and Teaching Methods are the areas of school-college articulation estimated by the total sample of respondents to have the least present degree of articulation.

6. 70% of the articulation practices in all areas of articulation are reported as largely informally structured by the total sample of respondents.
7. The areas of articulation estimated by the total sample of respondents as the most in need of improvement are: (a) Curriculum, (b) Career Guidance, (c) Academic Advisement, (d) Exit-Admissions, and (e) Teaching Methods.
8. The areas of articulation estimated by the total sample of respondents as least in need of improvement are: (a) Programs for Special Groups, (b) Grading Practices, (c) Occupational Education, (d) Personal & Social Counseling, (e) Crediting Practices, and (f) Adult Education.
9. Postsecondary institutions, compared to secondary institutions, felt that significantly more articulation was needed in the areas of Curriculum and Academic Advisement, while secondary institutions, relative to postsecondary institutions, felt that significantly more articulation was needed in the areas of Career Guidance and Work-Study Programs.
10. The major obstacles to improved and expanded school-college articulation perceived by both secondary and postsecondary respondents are: (a) High School and College Collective Bargaining Agencies and (b) Attitudes of High School and College Faculty.
11. Responses from both secondary and postsecondary respondents reveal a general absence of a sense of restrictive local or State rules, regulations, or laws as obstacles to articulation.

12. The major crediting modes of school-college articulation reported by postsecondary institutions are: (a) Advanced Placement Examinations (CEEB) (86% of reporting institutions), (b) College Level Examination Program (CLEP) subject examinations (79% of reporting institutions), and (c) New York State College Proficiency (CPEP) Examinations and Regents External Degree Examinations (76% combined).

13. Only a small percentage of Private 4-Year colleges in the State apparently utilize a common application form or admissions clearing house operation, while 64% (N = 42) SUNY institutions utilize a common application form.

14. Deferred Admissions is practiced by 75% of the Private 4-Year institutions and by 61% of the SUNY institutions surveyed.

15. Examination of the narrative descriptions of programs in the various areas of articulation indicates that those areas characterized by the greatest degree of diversity and innovation are (a) Early Admissions, (b) Curriculum, and (c) Academic Advisement. The degree of diversity and innovation appears to be most minimal in the areas of Exit-Admissions and Teaching Methods.

16. With the exception of State-supported programs for special groups and the extensive programs of CUNY, programs of school-college articulation in the area of Remediation appear to be very limited.

17. There are many diverse and innovative State-supported Programs for Special Groups which involve a high degree of school-college articulation. Beyond these, however, there appears to be only limited to moderate program development.

18. Most school-college articulation involving BOCES is conducted by community colleges, with a number of the programs being State-supported under the Vocational Education Act of 1968 (VEA).

19. Most school-college articulation programs involving Shared Facilities and/or Services are between community colleges and BOCES. Beyond these, program development is limited.

20. Beyond the sharing of faculty in some early admissions and curricular programs, there appears to be little articulation in the area of Shared Personnel.

21. The most extensive school-college articulation appears to take place between community colleges and high schools, rather than between other types of postsecondary institutions and high schools.

22. Community college personnel appear to be much more conscious of the nature and breadth of school-college articulation than their counterparts in other types of postsecondary institutions.

23. Both fewer problems and less faculty resistance concerning school-college articulation were reported by community college respondents.

24. Most faculty resistance at present, both organized and unorganized, was reported at the high schools. Most of the resistance centered on the loss

of bright students through early admissions programs and the possible loss of both state aid and faculty positions as a result of such practices.

25. Most respondents warned that widespread and serious organized resistance would come from both high school and college faculty if large scale articulation programs were forced upon them that appeared likely to threaten faculty jobs.

26. Role of the State and State Education Department - Most respondents were not in favor of direct State control in programs of school-college articulation. The majority favored voluntary arrangements worked out locally on an informal basis. The input of the State and State Education Department was seen as being one primarily of establishing guidelines, giving information on other programs in the State, and helping in an advisory role.

B. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Both the schools and the colleges in the State appear to be open to greater articulation between the two sectors. This is so, even though they do not regard articulation as a major educational concern at present. Most respondents who were interviewed were very much interested in learning more about innovative practices and programs at other schools. The idea of a Task Force or a series of regional or state-wide conferences on articulation was met with much favor.

2. Many of the large-scale school-college articulation practices and programs reported are directed toward the small minority of gifted students. Articulation programs meeting the needs of this group appear to be adequate, when compared to the needs of other groups of students. Early admissions and time-shortened programs, for example, most of which are restricted to gifted students, may have now reached a plateau in development; i.e., the number of students participating in such programs may not significantly increase in the coming years.

3. At present, the responsibility for monitoring and coordinating school-college articulation practices is diffused throughout the various divisions, departments, and offices of the State Education Department. Although much excellent work has been done in this fashion and valuable data gathered, there is some indication of duplication of effort and lack of adequate communication and coordination of research and other activities.

4. The Regents' recommendations for the improvement of the articulation of secondary and postsecondary education[1] are largely congruent with those of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.[2] There can be little doubt that the implementation of these recommendations by the procedures outlined by [illegible] will result in a greatly improved system of school-college articulation within New York State.

---

[1] University of the State of New York, loc. cit., pp. 11-15.

[2] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, loc. cit.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The State Department of Education should develop a handbook on school-college articulation which would include a compendium of practices and programs of institutions throughout the State. In addition, such a handbook should provide guidelines for the major types of programs now in use.

   Rationale: An articulation handbook distributed to all high schools and postsecondary institutions would not only serve as a major source of information, but would also aid individual institutions in overcoming any obstacles they might encounter in planning and initiating programs. Such a handbook would also enable high school counselors to direct students to particular programs meeting their needs.

2. The State Department of Education should conduct an internal study to determine how best to establish some form of centralized coordination and responsibility for school-college articulation. The development of a permanent coordinating board which would include representatives from both secondary and postsecondary education within the Department, as advocated by Wattenbarger,[3] should be carefully considered.

---

[3] James L. Wattenbarger, "Articulation with High Schools and Four Year Colleges and Universities," in O'Banion, Terry and Thurston, Alice, Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972, pp. 162-165.

Rationale: More centralized coordination and responsibility for school-college articulation is needed within the State Education Department. (See General Conclusions #3.)

3. The State Department of Education should establish a school-college articulation "hot-line," whereby individuals seeking information or aid could be given the information desired or directed to the appropriate division, department, or office.

   Rationale: Greater information flow to the schools and colleges concerning articulation practices is needed. A centralized source of authoritative information and advice would do much to alleviate this problem.

4. The State Department of Education should give increased support to those school-college articulation practices and programs which are directed to the following goals:

   (a) Increased attention to students of poor prior achievement. This would involve increased responsiveness to a wide range of individual learning styles, and major attention to improved remediation, counseling and academic placement.

   (b) Increased attention to occupational, career and cooperative education programs as well as liberal arts areas.

   (c) Increased attention to adult learners who have not yet attended college.

   Rationale: An adequate system of school-college articulation must include students of all types and all types of programs.

D. CONCLUSION

There is little doubt that extensive and manifold varieties of school-college articulation practices and programs exist within New York State. There is also little doubt that there are major needs for improved coordination at all levels and in many substantive areas. It is hoped that the findings of this study will assist all involved institutions and agencies in the State in furthering the improvement and expansion of school-college articulation to better meet the needs of all students.

....

APPENDICES

Page

A. Selected New York State Data Relating to School-College Articulation (Tables 19-26)............. 124

B. Telephone Interview Schedule..................... 141

C. Survey Questionnaire.......................... 148

A. SELECTED NEW YORK STATE DATA RELATING TO SCHOOL - COLLEGE ARTICULATION

List of Tables: Page

Table 19: High School Students Graduated in Less Than Four Years in Ten Leading Counties in New York State (June 1973 graduating class) 125

Table 20: High School Equivalency Diplomas Issued 1963-64 Through 1973-74 126

Table 21: Growth of State Support of Opportunity Programs - 1966-1975 - Opportunity Programs Appropriations 127

Table 22: New Registrants in Time-Shortened Baccalaureate Programs, by Control of Institution, for Fall 1971 and Fall 1973 128

Table 23: Colleges and Universities in New York State Granting Advanced Placement or Credit for Advanced Placement Examinations of the College Entrance Examination Board, Fall 1973 129

Table 24: Practices of Colleges and Universities in New York State in Granting Credit for Service Educational Experiences and the Use of GED Tests in Admission of Adults 130

Table 25: New York State Colleges, Universities, and Nursing Programs which Participate in the College Proficiency Examination Program 133

Table 26: New York State Colleges and Universities that Award Credit for Non-Classroom Experiential Learning in One or More Programs (Partial List) 139

Table 19

High School Students Graduated in Less Than Four Years in Ten Leading Counties in New York State (June 1973 graduating class)

County	No. of Graduates under 4 Years	% of Graduates under 4 Years
Brooklyn	2,575	11.5%
Nassau	1,755	6.0%
Queens	1,750	9.2%
Suffolk	916	4.5%
Manhattan	865	6.9%
Erie	774	4.4%
Westchester	736	5.2%
Bronx	569	4.7%
Monroe	495	4.7%
Niagara	196	4.9%
NYS Total	12,731	5.2%

Source: New York State Education Department

Table 20

High School Equivalency Diplomas Issued

1963-67 Through 1973-74

Year	Number of diplomas issued
1973-74	34,236
1972-73	30,173
1971-72	25,641
1970-71	22,235
1969-70	17,709
1968-69	15,800
1967-68	18,768
1966-67	14,444
1965-66	15,904
1964-65	14,628
1963-64	12,901

Source: New York State Education Department

Table 21

GROWTH OF STATE SUPPORT OF OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS
1966 - 1975
OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS

		CUNY-SEEK	CUNY-COLLEGE DISCOVERY	SUNY-EOP	HEOP	TOTALS AND AVERAGES
	Appropriation	1,500,000				1,500,000
	Enrollment	1,215				1,215
1966-67	Avg.per st.	1,235				1,235
		2,500,000		500,000		3,000,000
		1,630		249		1,879
1967-68		1,534		2,008		1,597
		5,500,000		1,973,000		7,473,000
		2,872		959		3,831
1968-69		1,915		2,057		1,951
		6,250,000		4,350,000	963,274	11,563,274
		4,109		2,582	1,887	8,578
1969-70		1,521		1,685	510	1,348
		9,000,000		6,702,000	3,999,390	19,701,390
		6,092		4,968	3,520	14,580
1970-71		1,477		1,349	1,136	1,351
		7,000,000	2,000,000	13,020,000	6,825,000	28,845,000
		7,321		6,713	4,883	18,917
1971-72		1,229		1,939	1,398	1,525
		12,500,000	2,000,000	13,868,000	6,850,000	33,218,000(35,218,000)*
		8,500		9,925	5,300	23,725
1972-73		1,471		1,397	1,292	1,400
		13,000,000	1,900,000	14,495,000	7,410,000	35,805,000
		9,800	4,300	10,200	5,300	29,600
1973-74		1,327	442	1,421	1.398	1,210
		14,750,000	1,700,000	14,741,000	7,591,000	38,782,000
		10,700	4,600	10,800	5,300	31,400
1974-75 (Projected)		1,379	370	1,365	1,432	1,235

*Includes College Discovery

Note: It is estimated that 50,000-100,000 persons in New York State are in need of assistance under opportunity programs.

Table 22

New Registrants in Time-Shortened Baccalaureate Programs, by Control of Institution, for Fall 1971 and Fall 1973

Control of Institution	New Registrants in Time-Shortened Baccalaureate Programs					
	Fall 1971			Fall 1973		
	Total	High School Graduates	Other[1]	Total	High School Graduates	Other[1]
Total State	1253	886	367	3940	2637	1303
State University	212	185	27	1513	1171	342
City University	170	10	160	263	54	209
Private Institutions	871	691	180	2164	1412	752

---

[1] Include those registrants who have not completed high school and who are enrolled in either regular or special programs.

Source: New York State Education Department.

Table 23

Colleges and Universities in New York State Granting Advanced Placement or Credit for Advanced Placement Examinations of the College Entrance Examination Board, Fall 1973.

- Adelphi
- Adirondack Comm.
- Albany C. of Pharmacy
- Alfred
- Auburn Comm.
- Bard
- Barnard
- Bernard M. Baruch
- Briarcliff
- Bronx Comm.
- Brooklyn C.
- Broome Comm.
- C. W. Post
- Canisius
- Cathedral C. of the Immaculate Conception
- Cazenovia
- City C.
- Clarkson C. of Technology
- Colgate
- C. of Insurance
- C. of Mount St. Vincent
- C. of New Rochelle
- C. of St. Rose
- C. of White Plains
- Columbia C. of Columbia U.
- Columbia-Green Comm.
- Columbia U., School of Engineering
- Comm. C. of the Finger Lakes
- Concordia
- Cooper Union
- Cornell
- Corning Comm.
- Dominican C. of Blauvelt
- Dowling
- Dutchess Comm.
- D'Youville
- Eastman School of Music
- Eisenhower
- Elizabeth Seton
- Elmira
- Erie Comm.
- Fashion Institute of Technology
- Finch
- Fordham
- Friends World
- Genesee Comm.
- Hamilton
- Harriman
- Hartwick
- Herbert H. Lehman
- Herkimer County Comm.
- Hilbert
- Hobart
- Hofstra
- Houghton
- Hudson Valley Comm.
- Hunter
- Iona
- Ithaca
- Jamestown Comm.
- Jefferson Comm.
- John Jay
- Keuka
- King's
- Ladycliff
- LeMoyne
- Long Island U. (The Brooklyn Center)
- Manhattan
- Manhattanville
- Maria
- Marist
- Marymount
- Marymount Manhattan
- Medaille
- Mercy
- Mohawk Valley Comm.
- Molloy
- Mount St. Mary
- Nassau Comm.
- Nazareth
- New York Institute of Technology
- New York U.
- Niagara
- Nyack
- Pace C., New York Campus
- Pace C. Westchester
- Paul Smith's C. of Arts and Sciences
- Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
- Pratt
- Queens
- Queensborough Comm.
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
- Roberts Wesleyan
- Rochester Institute of Technology
- Rockland Comm.
- Rosary Hill
- Russell Sage
- St. Elizabeth Hospital School of Nursing
- St. Francis
- St. John Fisher
- St. John's
- St. Joseph's
- St. Lawrence
- St. Thomas Aquinas
- Siena
- Skidmore
- State University of New York:
  - Agricultural and Technical C. at Alfred
  - Agricultural and Technical C. at Canton
  - Agricultural and Technical C. at Cobleskill
  - Agricultural and Technical C. at Delhi
  - Agricultural and Technical C. at Farmingdale
  - Agricultural and Technical C. at Morrisville
  - at Albany
  - at Binghamton
  - at Buffalo
  - at Stony Brook
  - C. at Old Westbury
  - C. of Arts and Science at Brockport
  - C. of Arts and Science at Buffalo
  - C. of Arts and Science at Cortland
  - C. of Arts and Science at Fredonia
  - C. of Arts and Science at Geneseo
  - C. of Arts and Science at New Paltz
  - C. of Arts and Science at Oneonta
  - C. of Arts and Science at Oswego
  - C. of Arts and Science at Plattsburgh
  - C. of Arts and Science at Potsdam
  - C. of Arts and Science at Purchase
  - C. of Environmental Science and Forestry at Syracuse U.
  - Maritime C.
  - Upstate Medical Center
- Staten Island Comm.
- Suffolk County Comm.
- Sullivan County Comm.
- Syracuse
- Touro
- Trocaire
- Ulster County Comm
- Union
- U.S. Military Acad.
- U. of Rochester
- Utica C. of Syracuse U.
- Vassar
- Wagner
- Wells
- William Smith

Source: College Entrance Examination Board, College Advanced Placement Policies, 1973.

Table 24

Practices of Colleges and Universities in New York State in Granting Credit for Service Educational Experiences and the Use of GED Tests in Admission of Adults

Institution	Question One	Question Two	Question Three
Academy of Aeronautics	no	yes	yes
Adelphi U.	yes	no	yes^{4}
Adirondack Comm. C.	yes	yes	yes
Alfred U.	yes	yes	yes
Auburn Comm. C.	yes	yes	yes
Barnard C.	no policy	no policy	no policy
Bennett C.	no policy	no policy	no policy
Bernard M. Baruch C.	yes	yes	yes^{3}
Briarcliff C.	no policy	no policy	no policy
Bronx Comm. C.	no	no	yes^{4}
Brooklyn C.	yes	yes	yes^{4}
Broome Tech. Comm. C.	no policy	yes	yes
C. W. Post C.	yes	no	yes
Canisius C.	no	no	yes^{4}
Cathedral C. of the Immaculate Conception	no policy	no policy	no policy
City C. of New York	yes	yes	no
Colgate U.	yes	yes	yes
C. of Insurance	yes	yes	yes
C. of Mt. St. Vincent	yes	yes	yes
C. of New Rochelle	yes	yes	yes
C. of St. Rose	yes	yes	yes
Columbia U.	yes^{10}	no policy	yes
Comm. C. of the Finger Lakes	no	yes	yes^{4}
Cooper Union	no policy	yes	yes
Cornell U.	yes	yes	yes
Cornell U. C. of Ag.	yes	yes	yes^{4}
Dominican C. of Blauvelt	no policy	no policy	yes
Dutchess Comm. C.	no policy	no policy	yes
D'Youville C.	no policy	no policy	yes
Eisenhower C.	no policy	no policy	no policy
Elizabeth Seton C.	no policy	no policy	no policy
Elmira C.	yes	yes	yes
Fashion Inst. of Tech.	yes	yes	no policy
Fordham U.	yes^{10}	no	yes
Fulton-Montgomery Comm. C.	yes	yes	yes
Genesee Comm. C.	yes	yes	yes
Good Counsel C.	no policy	no policy	no
Hamilton C.	yes	no	yes
Hartwick C.	no policy	yes	yes
Herbert H. Lehman C.	no	yes	no
Hofstra U.	no	no	yes
Houghton C.	yes	no policy	yes
Hudson Valley Comm. C.	no	yes	yes
Hunter C.	yes	yes	yes

Key to Questions:

1. Does the policy of your institution permit granting credit for formal service school courses listed in the 1968 Guide?
2. Does the policy of your institution permit granting credit for successful completion of USAFI courses?
3. Does the policy of your institution permit the admission of non-high-school-graduate adults who use GED test scores as evidence of their ability to undertake college work?

Table 24 - Page 2

Institution	Question One	Question Two	Question Three
Iona C.	yes	yes	yes
Jamestown Comm. C.	no	no	yes
Jefferson Comm. C.	no	yes	yes[4]
Julliard Sch.	yes	no	yes
Keuka C.	no policy	no policy	no policy
King's C.	no policy	yes	yes
LeMoyne C.	no policy	yes	yes
Manhatten C.	yes	yes	yes
Manhattan Sch. of Music	no policy	yes	yes
Manhattanville C.	no	no	no
Maria Regina C.	no policy	no policy	yes
Marist C.	yes	yes	yes
Marymount Manhattan C.	yes	yes	yes
Medialle C.	no policy	no policy	no policy
Mercy C.	yes	yes	yes
Mohawk Valley Comm. C.	no	yes	yes
Molloy C.	no policy	no policy	no policy
Monroe Comm. C.	yes	yes	yes
Mt. St. Mary C.	no policy	no policy	no policy
Nazareth C. of Rochester	no policy	yes	yes
Niagara Co. Comm. C.	(5)	yes	yes
Niagara U.	no policy	no policy	no policy
New Sch. for Social Research	no policy	no policy	yes
New York Inst. of Tech.	no policy	yes	yes
New York U.	yes	yes	yes
North Country Comm. C.	yes	yes	yes
Nyack Missionary C.	yes	no	yes
Onondaga Comm. C.	no policy	yes	yes
Orange Co. Comm. C.	yes	yes	yes[4]
Pace C.	yes	no	yes
Packer Collegiate Inst.	no policy	no policy	no policy
Parsons Sch. of Design	yes	yes	yes
Polytech. Inst. of Brooklyn	no	no	yes
Queens C.	yes	yes	yes
Rabbinical Sem. of America	yes	yes	yes
RCA Institutes, Inc.	no	no	yes
Rensselaer Polytech. Inst.	yes	yes	yes
Richmond C.	no policy	no policy	yes
Roberts Wesleyan C.	no policy	yes[12]	yes
Rochester Inst. of Tech.	no policy	yes	yes
Rockland Comm. C.	yes	yes	yes
Rosary Hill C.	yes	yes	yes
Russell Sage C.	yes	yes	yes
St. Bonaventure U.	yes	yes	yes
St. Francis C.	yes	no	yes
St. John Fisher C.	yes	yes	yes
St. John's U.	no	yes	yes
St. Joseph's C. for Women	no policy	no policy	yes
St. Lawrence U.	no policy	yes	yes
St. Thomas Aquinas C.	no policy	no policy	no policy
Siena C.	yes	yes	yes
SUNY, Albany	no	no	yes
SUNY, Binghamton (Harpur C.)	yes	yes	yes
SUNY, Brockport	no policy	yes	yes

Table 24 - Page 3

Institution	Question One	Question Two	Question Three
SUNY, C. at Buffalo	no policy	yes	yes
SUNY, Buffalo	yes	yes	yes[4]
SUNY, C. at Cortland	no	no	yes
SUNY, C. at Fredonia	yes	no	yes[4]
SUNY, C. at Geneseo	yes	yes	yes
SUNY, Maritime C.	yes	yes	yes
SUNY, New Paltz	yes	yes	yes
SUNY, Old Westbury C.	no policy	no policy	yes
SUNY, Oswego	yes	yes	no policy
SUNY, Plattsburgh	yes	yes	yes
SUNY, Potsdam	yes	yes	yes[4]
SUNY, C. of Forestry at Syracuse U.	no	yes	yes
SUNY, Stony Brook	no	no	yes
SUNY, Upstate Medical Center	no policy	no policy	no policy
SUNY, Ag. & Tech. C., Alfred	no	yes[2]	yes
SUNY, Ag. & Tech. C., Cobleskill	no	yes	yes
SUNY, Ag. & Tech. C., Delhi	yes	yes	yes
SUNY, Ag. & Tech. C., Farmingdale	yes	yes	yes
SUNY, Ag. & Tech. C., Morrisville	yes	yes	yes
Staten Island Comm. C.	yes	yes	yes
Suffolk Co. Comm. C.	no	yes[2]	yes
Sullivan Co. Comm. C.	yes	no policy	yes[4]
Syracuse U.	yes	yes	yes
Teachers Inst. of Jewish Theological Sem.	no	no	yes
Union C.	no	yes	no
U. S. Merchant Marine Academy	yes	no	yes
U. of Rochester	yes	yes	yes
Vassar C.	no policy	no policy	no policy
Voorhees Tech. Inst.	yes	yes	yes
Wagner C.	yes	yes	yes
Wells C.	no policy	no policy	no policy
York C.	yes	yes	yes
Yeshiva U.	yes	yes	yes

Source: Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences, American Council on Education, College Accreditation Policies for Non-traditional Education, 1970.

Table 25

NEW YORK STATE COLLEGES, UNIVERSITIES and NURSING PROGRAMS WHICH PARTICIPATE in the COLLEGE PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION PROGRAM

This is a listing of colleges, universities, and nursing programs which have either granted credit for College Proficiency Examinations or have indicated that they will do so. The fact that an institution is not listed does not necessarily indicate that it will not grant credit. Further, not all institutions of higher learning listed will grant credit for all College Proficiency Examinations. In addition, each institution reserves the right to decide whether it will grant credit, and how much credit it will grant, on an individual basis.

NEW YORK STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WHICH PARTICIPATE IN THE COLLEGE PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION PROGRAM

ACADEMY OF AERONAUTICS
ADELPHI UNIVERSITY
ADIRONDACK COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ALFRED UNIVERSITY
AUBURN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BARD COLLEGE
BENNETT COLLEGE
BERNARD M. BARUCH COLLEGE, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BRIARCLIFF COLLEGE
BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BROOKLYN CENTER, LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY
BROOKLYN COLLEGE, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
BROOME COMMUNITY COLLEGE
CANISIUS COLLEGE
CATHEDRAL COLLEGE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION
CAZENOVIA COLLEGE
CITY COLLEGE, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
COLGATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF INSURANCE
COLLEGE OF MOUNT SAINT VINCENT
COLLEGE OF NEW ROCHELLE
COLLEGE OF SAINT ROSE

COLLEGE OF WHITE PLAINS
COLUMBIA-GREENE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF THE FINGER LAKES
CONCORDIA COLLEGE
COOPER UNION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE AND ART
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
CORNING COMMUNITY COLLEGE
C.W. POST CENTER, LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY
DOMINICAN COLLEGE OF BLAUVELT
DOWLING COLLEGE
DUTCHESS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
D'YOUVILLE COLLEGE
ELIZABETH SETON COLLEGE
ELMIRA COLLEGE
ERIE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
FASHION INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
FULTON-MONTGOMERY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
GENESEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
HAMILTON COLLEGE
HARRIMAN COLLEGE
HARTWICK COLLEGE
HERBERT H. LEHMAN COLLEGE, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
HILBERT COLLEGE
HOBART AND WILLIAM SMITH COLLEGES
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY
HOUGHTON COLLEGE
HUDSON VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
HUNTER COLLEGE, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
IMMACULATE CONCEPTION SEMINARY AT TROY
IONA COLLEGE
ITHACA COLLEGE
JAMESTOWN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
JEFFERSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
JULLIARD SCHOOL OF MUSIC
JUNIOR COLLEGE OF ALBANY, RUSSELL SAGE COLLEGE
KEUKA COLLEGE
KINGS COLLEGE
KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
LADYCLIFF COLLEGE
LEMOYNE COLLEGE
MANHATTAN COLLEGE
MANHATTAN SCHOOL OF MUSIC
MANHATTANVILLE COLLEGE
MARIA COLLEGE OF ALBANY
MARIA REGINA COLLEGE
MARIST COLLEGE
MARYMOUNT COLLEGE
MARYMOUNT MANHATTAN COLLEGE

Table 25 (Cont.)

MATER DEI COLLEGE
MEDAILLE COLLEGE
MERCY COLLEGE
MOHAWK VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MOLLOY COLLEGE
MONROE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MOUNT SAINT MARY COLLEGE
MOUNT SINAI SCHOOL OF NURSING, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NAZARETH COLLEGE
NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH
NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NEW YORK INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
NIAGARA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NIAGARA UNIVERSITY
NORTH COUNTRY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NYACK COLLEGE
ONONDAGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ORANGE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PACE UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY
PACE UNIVERSITY, WESTCHESTER
PAUL SMITH'S COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
PRATT INSTITUTE
QUEENS COLLEGE, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
RICHMOND COLLEGE, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
ROBERTS WESLEYAN COLLEGE
ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ROCKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ROSARY HILL COLLEGE
RUSSELL SAGE COLLEGE
ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY
ST. FRANCIS COLLEGE
ST. JOHN FISHER COLLEGE
ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY
ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE
ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY
ST. THOMAS AQUINAS COLLEGE
SARAH LAWRENCE COLLEGE
SCHENECTADY COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SIENA COLLEGE
SKIDMORE COLLEGE
STATEN ISLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
  UNIVERSITY CENTER AT ALBANY
    AT BINGHAMTON
    AT BUFFALO
    AT STONY BROOK

Table 25 (cont.)

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE AT BROCKPORT
AT BUFFALO
AT CORTLAND
AT FREDONIA
AT GENESEO
AT NEW PALTZ
AT OLD WESTBURY
AT ONEONTA
AT OSWEGO
AT PLATTSBURGH
AT POTSDAM
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AGRICULTURAL & TECHNICAL COLLEGE AT ALFRED
AT CANTON
AT COBLESKILL
AT DELHI
AT FARMINGDALE
AT MORRISVILLE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, SPECIAL SUNY INSTITUTIONS
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AT CORNELL
COLLEGE OF FORESTRY AT SYRACUSE
MARITIME COLLEGE
UPSTATE MEDICAL CENTER
SUFFOLK COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SULLIVAN COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
TOMPKINS-CORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TROCAIRE COLLEGE
ULSTER COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
UNION COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER
UTICA COLLEGE OF SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
VASSAR COLLEGE
VILLA MARIA COLLEGE OF BUFFALO
WAGNER COLLEGE
WELLS COLLEGE
WESTCHESTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
YESHIVA UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK STATE COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF NURSING AND HOSPITAL SCHOOLS WHICH PARTICIPATE IN THE COLLEGE PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION PROGRAM

I. COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF NURSING

ADIRONDACK COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ADELPHI UNIVERSITY
ALFRED UNIVERSITY
BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BROOKLYN CENTER, LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY
BROOME COMMUNITY COLLEGE

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF NURSING
COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF THE FINGER LAKES
CORNING COMMUNITY COLLEGE
C.W. POST CENTER, LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY
D'YOUVILLE COLLEGE
DUTCHESS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
FULTON-MONTGOMERY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
HUDSON VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
HUNTER COLLEGE, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
JAMESTOWN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
JUNIOR COLLEGE OF ALBANY, RUSSELL SAGE COLLEGE
LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY
MARIA COLLEGE OF ALBANY
MOHAWK VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MONROE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MOUNT SAINT MARY COLLEGE
MOUNT SINAI SCHOOL OF NURSING, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NIAGARA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NIAGARA UNIVERSITY
ONONDAGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ORANGE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PACE UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY
PACE UNIVERSITY, WESTCHESTER
QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
RUSSELL SAGE COLLEGE
SKIDMORE COLLEGE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
  UNIVERSITY CENTER AT BINGHAMTON
    AT BUFFALO
    AT STONY BROOK
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
  COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES AT BROCKPORT
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AGRICULTURAL
  AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE AT ALFRED
    AT CANTON
SUFFOLK COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
TROCAIRE COLLEGE
ULSTER COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER
WAGNER COLLEGE

II. HOSPITAL SCHOOLS OF NURSING

ALBANY MEDICAL CENTER, ALBANY
BETH ISRAEL MEDICAL CENTER, NEW YORK CITY
BINGHAMTON STATE HOSPITAL, BINGHAMTON
CHAMPLAIN VALLEY PHYSICIANS HOSPITAL, PLATTSBURGH
CRAIG STATE HOSPITAL, SONYEA
CREEDMORE STATE HOSPITAL, QUEENS VILLAGE

Table 25 (cont.)

DEACONESS HOSPITAL, BUFFALO
E. J. MEYER MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, BUFFALO
ELLIS HOSPITAL, SCHENECTADY
GENESEE HOSPITAL, ROCHESTER
HARLEM HOSPITAL CENTER, NEW YORK
HARLEM VALLEY STATE HOSPITAL, WINGDALE
JEWISH HOSPITAL OF BROOKLYN, BROOKLYN
LENOX HILL HOSPITAL, NEW YORK
MARCY STATE HOSPITAL, MARCY
MEMORIAL SCHOOL OF NURSING, ALBANY
MILLARD FILLMORE HOSPITAL, BUFFALO
MOUNT VERNON HOSPITAL, MOUNT VERNON
PILGRIM STATE HOSPITAL, WEST BRENTWOOD
ROCHESTER STATE HOSPITAL, ROCHESTER
ROCKLAND STATE HOSPITAL, ORANGEBURG
ROOSEVELT HOSPITAL, NEW YORK CITY
ST. CLARE'S HOSPITAL, NEW YORK CITY
ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL, ELMIRA
ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL, SYRACUSE
ST. VINCENT'S MEDICAL CENTER, STATEN ISLAND
SISTERS OF CHARITY HOSPITAL, BUFFALO
WESTCHESTER SCHOOL OF NURSING, GRASSLANDS HOSPITAL, VALHALLA
WILLARD STATE HOSPITAL, WILLARD

III. COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRACTICAL NURSE PROGRAM

TOMPKINS-CORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Source: New York State Education Department

Table 26

New York State Colleges and Universities That Award Credit for Non-Classroom Experiential Learning in One or More Programs

Private

Adelphi University

Bard College

C. W. Post College of Long Island University

College of New Rochelle

College of St. Rose

College of White Plains

Dowling College

Friends World College

Fordham University

Harriman College

Hofstra University

Iona College

Marymount College

Mercy College

New York Institute of Technology

New York University

Pace University

St. John's University (St. Vincent's College)

St. Joseph's College

Sarah Lawrence College

Skidmore College

Syracuse University

Touro College

Table 26 (Cont'd)

Public

City University of New York
- Brooklyn College
- John Jay College of Criminal Justice
- Queens College
- The CUNY B. A. program

State University of New York
- College at Old Westbury
- Empire State College
- Stony Brook

Source: New York State Education Department

B. TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Theme

The interview should focus on cooperative programs between schools and colleges in major categories. A number of programs may involve several categories.

General Instructions for Interview:

1. Fill in attached questionnaire sheets.
2. Ask the following general questions:

What are most important forms of needed articulation? (See Inventory) How would respondent improve articulation?

What do you see as the role of schools, colleges, BOCES, Education Department, professional organizations?

What are major problems/obstacles (e.g., faculty-union resistance, laws and regulations, poor guidance services, financing patterns)?

What is the potential for various forms of articulation?

How important as an issue or concern is school-college articulation?

Interview Questionnaire:

High School-College Articulation

Description of existing or planned programs.

1. Brief description of program, including elements of Inventory included.

   a) Date begun or planned beginning.

   b) Number of students annually involved.

   c) Number of faculty involved.

   d) Limitations or potential in scale.

   e) Strengths

   f) Limitations, obstacles, problems

Inventory of Categories of

Cooperative School-College Articulation

	Yes	No
1. **Sharing of students**	☐	☐
Illustrations: (a) dual enrollment in high school and college	☐	☐
(b) special program in college for high school students	☐	☐
(c) other	☐	☐
2. **Sharing of faculty**	☐	☐
Illustrations: (a) high school faculty teaching in college	☐	☐
(b) college faculty teaching in high school	☐	☐
(c) other	☐	☐

Inventory of Categories of Cooperative School-College Articulation

	Yes	No
3. **Sharing of facilities**	☐	☐
Illustrations: (a) sharing of BOCES and community college facilities (cite)	☐	☐
(b) other	☐	☐

Inventory of Categories of Cooperative School-College Articulation

		Yes	No
4. **Curriculum Articulation**		☐	☐
Illustrations:	(a) joint planning of occupational programs between high school and BOCES	☐	☐
	(b) agreements between high school and colleges for advanced standing	☐	☐
	(c) other	☐	☐

151

	Yes	No
5. **Guidance & counseling of students**	☐	☐
Illustrations: (a) pre-counseling of high school students for placement in college	☐	☐
(b) special identification and counseling of groups such as:		
early admissions students	☐	☐
remedial students	☐	☐
adults	☐	☐
(c) other	☐	☐

Inventory of Categories of Cooperative School-College Articulation

	Yes	No
6. Programs for special student clienteles	☐	☐
Illustrations: (a) early admissions:		
Type A - regis. in high school	☐	☐
Type B - regis. in college	☐	☐
other	☐	☐
(b) minority students	☐	☐
(c) adults:		
high school graduates	☐	☐
non-high school graduates	☐	☐
(d) women	☐	☐
(e) workers	☐	☐
(f) retired persons	☐	☐
(g) servicemen	☐	☐
(h) other	☐	☐

C. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY
AND COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12224

Monday
September 30
19 74

Dear Colleague:

The Regents have recently approved a position paper entitled The Articulation of Secondary and Post-Secondary Education, which deals with the effective coordination of learning and teaching between these two levels of education. By now, you should have received a copy.

In support of the Regents position paper, my office has been given a grant by the National Academy of Education, to be used to survey the extent of articulation practices between secondary and post-secondary institutions. I am seeking your cooperation in providing us with the information requested in the enclosed survey.

The data obtained as a result of this study will be of importance to all of us, and a summary of results will be shared with you.

Dr. Norman C. Snyder is serving as the Project Director. Any questions concerning the study or the survey instrument should be directed to him or to Robert McHugh. They may be reached at the return address noted at the top of the enclosed questionnaire.

Your attention to this study is greatly appreciated.

Faithfully yours,

Ewald B. Nyquist

Enclosure

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of College Evaluation
Twin Towers, Room 1925
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12210

SURVEY OF COOPERATIVE SCHOOL-COLLEGE ARTICULATION PRACTICES IN NEW YORK STATE

Name and Address of Institution: ______________________________

____

____

Person completing survey: Name: ______________________________

Title: ____________________ Phone: ____________________
Area Code Number Ext.

Instructions

The information requested on this form will be used to determine the extent of cooperative programs between high schools and postsecondary institutions which articulate the transition from high school to college curricula.

After reviewing the definitions below and the attachments containing illustrative examples of modes of high school-college articulation, please answer the eight questions on this form with respect to the current or existing policies or practices at your particular institution.

Please return the completed form in the enclosed preaddressed envelope requiring no postage. We would appreciate your response as soon as possible but not later than October 30.

Definition of Terms (See attachments A and B)

Cooperative Articulation: As used here, cooperative articulation refers to all planned practices and programs which directly connect secondary and postsecondary education and which involve cooperative arrangements between the two.

Cooperative Programmatic Articulation: Within a given area of articulation, refers to a well developed, systematic and formal plan or procedure which involves a high degree of cooperation between secondary and postsecondary institutions in all or most modes of cooperation.

I. Degree of Cooperative High School-College Articulation by Articulation Area and Mode of Cooperation:

In the first question you are being asked to estimate the overall extent to which your institution engages in cooperative practices in various areas of articulation and to estimate whether such practices are structured in a mostly formal or informal manner.

For each of the modes listed, under a specific articulation area, please check the box which indicates the estimated degree of cooperation and whether or not such practices are formally or informally structured at your institution.

Each of the specific articulation areas also requires your response to your estimate of the overall extent of cooperative programmatic articulation (please refer to definitions listed below the general instructions).

A. Exit-Admission Practices (See attachment A, number 1 a-1, page 13.)

Mode of Cooperation	Degree of Cooperation or Sharing				Structure	
	Much	Some	Little	None	Formal	Informal
Information exchange, communication, and feedback	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Decision-making.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluation (Practice or Program)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shared Personnel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shared physical plant, special facilities, and services . . .	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Estimated overall cooperative programmatic articulation in above modes	☐	☐	☐	☐	--	--

B. Academic Advisement Practices (See attachment A, number 2 a-e, pgs. 13,14.)

Mode of Cooperation	Degree of Cooperation or Sharing				Structure	
	Much	Some	Little	None	Formal	Informal
Information exchange, communication, and feedback	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Decision-making.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluation (Practice or Program)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shared Personnel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shared physical plant, special facilities, and services . . .	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Estimated overall cooperative programmatic articulation in above modes	☐	☐	☐	☐	--	--

C. Curriculum Practices (See attachment A, number 3 a-e, page 14.)

Mode of Cooperation	Degree of Cooperation or Sharing				Structure	
	Much	Some	Little	None	Formal	Informal
Information exchange, communication, and feedback	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Decision-making.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluation (Practice or Program)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shared Personnel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shared physical plant, special facilities, and services . . .	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Estimated overall cooperative programmatic articulation in above modes	☐	☐	☐	☐	--	--

D. Teaching Methods - Teaching Effectiveness (See attachment A, number 4 a-o, pages 14, 15.)

Mode of Cooperation	Degree of Cooperation or Sharing				Structure	
	Much	Some	Little	None	Formal	Informal
Information exchange, communication, and feedback	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Decision-making.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluation (Practice or Program)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shared Personnel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shared physical plant, special facilities, and services . . .	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Estimated overall cooperative programmatic articulation in above modes	☐	☐	☐	☐	--	--

E. Grading Practices (See attachment A, number 5 a-e, page 15.)

Mode of Cooperation	Degree of Cooperation or Sharing				Structure	
	Much	Some	Little	None	Formal	Informal
Information exchange, communication, and feedback	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Decision-making.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluation (Practice or Program)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shared Personnel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shared physical plant, special facilities, and services . . .	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Estimated overall cooperative programmatic articulation in above modes	☐	☐	☐	☐	--	--